

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

VOLUME LIII

DECEMBER 1962

NUMBER 4

JEAN HYTIER, *General Editor*

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ
DINO BIGONGIARI
LEROY C. BREUNIG
JULES BRODY
ANGEL DEL RÍO
OTIS FELLOWS

DONALD M. FRAME
BERT M-P. LEEFMANS
GITA MAY
JUSTIN O'BRIEN
LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM

MARIO A. PEI
DANIEL F. PENHAM
JEANNE VARNEY PLEASANTS
MICHAEL RIFFATERRE
LEON S. ROUDIEZ
JAMES F. SHEARER

RICHARD A. KATZ, *Managing Editor*

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| The Books and Stories of Rabelais | ABRAHAM C. KELLER | 241 |
| The Prince de Ligne and Diderot | BASIL GUY | 260 |

REVIEW ARTICLE

- | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|
| Deux nouveaux portraits de Jean-Jacques | GEORGES MAY | 269 |
|---|-------------|-----|

REVIEWS

- | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----|
| Louis Kukenheim, <i>Esquisse historique de la linguistique française et de ses rapports avec la linguistique générale</i> | [LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM] | 280 |
| Helmut Hatzfeld et Yves le Hir, <i>Essai de bibliographie critique de stylistique française et romane (1955-1960)</i> | [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE] | 281 |
| Sem Dresden, Lein Geschiere et Bernard Bray, <i>La notion de structure</i> | [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE] | 283 |
| Joseph Anthony Mazzeo, <i>Medieval Cultural Tradition in Dante's "Comedy"</i> | [EDWARD WILLIAMSON] | 285 |
| C. A. Mayer, <i>La Religion de Marot</i> | [EMILE V. TELLE] | 286 |
| D. B. Wilson, <i>Ronsard, Poet of Nature</i> | [VICTOR E. GRAHAM] | 288 |

Raymond Lebègue, <i>Ronsard</i>	[ISIDORE SILVER]	289
William L. Wiley, <i>The Early Public Theatre in France</i>	[BETTINA L. KNAPP]	291
Will G. Moore, <i>French Classical Literature: An Essay</i>	[E. B. O. BORGERHOFF]	292
Georges May, <i>Rousseau par lui-même</i>	[IRA WADE]	295
Percy G. Adams, ed., <i>Crèvecoeur's Eighteenth-Century Travels in Pennsylvania and New York</i>	[ADRIENNE D. HYTIER]	297
Georges Solovieff, ed., <i>Madame de Staël: Lettres à Narbonne;</i> Simone Balayé, ed., <i>Madame de Staël: Lettres à Ribbing</i>	[JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ]	298
F. G. Healey, <i>The Literary Culture of Napoleon</i>	[PETER GAY]	302
Irving Puttler, <i>The Pessimism of Leconte de Lisle: The Work and the Time</i>	[ELLIOTT M. GRANT]	304
Howard Sutton, <i>The Life and Works of Jean Richepin</i>	[MAXWELL A. SMITH]	306
W. D. Halls, <i>Maurice Maeterlinck: A Study of His Life and Thought</i>	[THOMAS BISHOP]	307
Elaine Marks, <i>Colette</i>	[ALVIN LABAT]	309
A. Eustis, <i>Marcel Arland, Benjamin Crémieux, Ramon Fernandez: Trois critiques de la Nouvelle Revue Française</i>	[LOUIS PAMPLUME]	311
Gerda Zeltner-Neukomm, <i>Das Wagnis des französischen Gegenwartromans</i>	[MARCEL MULLER]	312
Victor Brombert, <i>The Intellectual Hero</i>	[JEAN CARDUNER]	314
René Girard, <i>Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque</i>	[ARMAND HOOG]	316
Index		319

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y. It is printed at the Waldon Press, 150 Lafayette St., New York 13, N.Y. Single copies \$1.50 (foreign, \$1.60); \$6.00 a year (foreign, including Canada, \$6.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to Professor Jean Hytier, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the *MLA Style-Sheet* which originally appeared in *PMLA*, LXVI (1951), 3-31, and is available in reprints.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y.

Copyright © 1962 by Columbia University Press

THE BOOKS AND STORIES OF RABELAIS

By Abraham C. Keller

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

THE READER OF RABELAIS' *Tiers Livre*, delighted with Panurge's paradoxes on debts and debtors, no sooner finishes the ingenious opening chapters than he hits upon another conversation of the same cast. Indeed, witty conversation follows witty conversation with such breathtaking speed in the early chapters of this book—debts and debtors, why newlyweds should be exempted from military service, the importance of codpieces, Shall-I-Marry-Shall-I-not-Marry, etc.—that the reader will easily agree with Anatole France's superlatives about Book Three, or with Rabelais' own modest boast that his supply of "joyeuseté et railerie" is inexhaustible. He will feel himself, along with Pantagruel's 9,876,543,210 Utopians (not counting women and children) transported to a realm far distant from that which, with giant steps, he traversed in Books I and II; and in this realm, if his mind be sprightly and his laughter loose, he will dwell for many a gay chapter and many a tall tale.

But, by what infallible indices does our reader take leave of the comic world of *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*, created by Rabelais in the early 1530's, and ascend with him twelve years later to regions of subtler intellect and higher art? He has—to take one small but distinctive and unmistakable clue—the charmingly irrelevant "Mais" of the beginning of Chapter 6. "Mais (demanda Panurge) en quelle loy estoit-ce constitué et estably, que . . . les nouveaulx mariez seroient exempts d'aller en guerre pour la premiere année?"¹ Where in his earlier books was Rabelais quite so irrelevant, quite so unconcerned with the logical bonds of his discourse? Or, recalling the gross exaggerations of the first two books, and even more, some of the narrative gaucheries—such as Panurge's virtually forcing Pantagruel to ask him for the story of his escape from the Turks: "Je leur contoys comment ces diables de Turcs sont bien malheureux de ne boire goutte de vin," when in fact he was saying nothing of the kind; but the story had to be brought in somehow—recalling this, can our reader find traces of such awkwardness in Books III and IV? Statistics being useful as reinforcement of impressions gathered unscientifically, our reader will not fail to observe that Rabelais, the world-renowned story-teller, is plying his trade with greater zeal in 1546 than

1. Quotations are from the *Œuvres complètes de Rabelais*, ed. by Jean Plattard, 5 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946-48).

he was in 1532, that, to be precise, he produces almost exactly four times as many stories and anecdotes in Books III and IV as he did in Books I and II.

How did the writer who, with heavy hand, dragged the story of Panurge's escape before us become the sleight-of-hand artist who can now make the story of Villon's revenge, or the Devil and the Farmer, or the Roast-Shop and the Coin appear out of thin air? Why does the late teller of *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*, who scarcely twice in those books asked us to sit down with him to enjoy a good story which was not part of the evening's business, issue us a dozen invitations in Books III and IV, not to mention the hors-d'œuvres in the form of anecdotes and assorted minor brands of yarn?

I

Perhaps the first difference which strikes the reader as he ponders the changing quality of Rabelais' books has to do with the number of short stories and their relationship to the longer narrative. Each of the five books has its own over-all plot, and within that, sometimes as part of the plot and sometimes as extras, Rabelais has placed short narrations, varying in number from book to book. Considering now only the narrations which, because of their relatively substantial length and fullness, may be designated "stories," we observe that in the first two books all but one or two form part of the sustained narrative. This does not detract from their value as short stories: certainly Panurge's courtship of the lady of Paris or the pilgrims eaten in the salad can be read pleasurable without reference to the rest; but they are, as regards both their main characters and the actual events depicted, part of the whole book. The only clear case of an extra is the story of the Lion and the Fox, in *Pantagruel*, Chapter 15. Panurge's account of his escape from the Turks, though not strictly part of the narrative, is connected to the movement of the book as background material on our newly-met character and can hardly be regarded as an extra.

In the later books the situation is precisely reversed, all the stories except one or two being "extras." The tale of Dindenault and his sheep is clearly part of the whole narrative; that of the Devil and the Farmer is border-line: like Panurge's escape from the Turks, it provides background for something in the longer narrative and is therefore not an entirely detached story. All the other stories are separated from the action of the books as a whole.²

2. It is my opinion that Jean Plattard gives the wrong impression when he sharply contrasts Rabelais and Boccaccio: "Dans le *Décameron* de Boccace . . . la nouvelle est une anecdote narrée pour elle-même, indépendamment de toute argumentation ou thèse générale. Au contraire, chez Rabelais, la plupart des contes et nouvelles sont

This reversal would seem to indicate some change in Rabelais' approach to these two aspects of his work. The most obvious speculation is that in Books III and IV he felt freer to break into his long account with short stories, and this speculation is borne out by a consideration of the sheer number of stories he tells. Disregarding the question of whether they are integral to the whole or extras, there are nine stories in *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel* as against fifteen in the *Tiers* and *Quart Livres*. The number, assuredly, is not easy to determine, for who is to say which episode, if part of the larger narrative, may be regarded as an independent story, and in the case of extras, where the line is to be drawn between a genuine story and a mere anecdote or reminiscence? In general, I have accepted as stories the live portrayals and omitted accounts or summaries which tell about rather than actually tell. There are many border-line cases, and it would be both laborious and uninteresting to justify each inclusion and each omission; but it seems safe to say that, though no two investigators would be apt to compile identical lists, the disputable cases are of no crucial importance, and that a slightly different selection of stories would scarcely affect the discussion of the development of Rabelais' story-telling art. The "stories," then, are the following:

1. Gargantua's grief at the death of his wife (*Pant.*, 3).
2. Pantagruel's meeting with the Limousin (*Pant.*, 6).
3. Pantagruel's meeting with Panurge (*Pant.*, 9).
4. Panurge's escape from the Turks (*Pant.*, 14).
5. The lion, the fox, and the old lady (*Pant.*, 15).
6. Panurge's courtship of, and revenge on, the lady of Paris (*Pant.*, 21-22).
7. Poor Janotus (*Garg.*, 18-20).
8. The beginning of the war (*Garg.*, 25).
9. The pilgrims eaten in a salad (*Garg.*, 38).
10. Diogenes and his tub (III, Prol.).
11. Hans Carvel and his ring (III, 28).
12. The Pope and the nuns (III, 34).
13. The roast-shop and the coin (III, 37).
14. Perrin Dendin and his law cases (III, 41).
15. The Gascon warrior (III, 42).

appelés par le développement d'un 'devis' ou se rattachent à une autre narration. Naturellement, l'écrivain insiste sur le trait, le détail, l'élément qui a fait rentrer l'anecdote dans son propos et qui sert à son argumentation." (*La Vie et l'œuvre de Rabelais* [Paris, 1939], p. 120). For a story to be associated with "le développement d'un 'devis'" is hardly poles apart from Boccaccio's method. Though assuredly Rabelais effects an integration of his stories into the whole, it is, as Plattard says, often by means of a detail, which is scarcely the opposite of Boccaccio's way. The opposite of Boccaccio's method would be for the stories to form a real part of the larger narrative, and this, as I have pointed out, happens infrequently. Plattard recognizes that at least some of Rabelais' stories are detached; his statement contrasting Rabelais and Boccaccio ought, therefore, to be taken in a limited sense.

16. The judgment of the Arcopagites (III, 44).
17. Couillatris and his hatchet (IV, Prol.).
18. The dog and the fox turned to stone (IV, Prol.).
19. Dindenault and his sheep (IV, 5-8).
20. Guyercharois' lady-kissing disaster (IV, 10).
21. Basché and the subpoena-servers (IV, 12-15).
22. The revenge of François Villon (IV, 13).
23. The death of Pan (IV, 28).
24. The devil and the farmer (IV, 45-47).
25. The horse and the ass (V, 7).

The greater number of stories in the late books, along with the fact that they have become more detached from the whole, would seem to show not only a greater boldness but also, perhaps, a greater interest on Rabelais' part in the short stories.³ This change of interest, if it exists, should make itself visible in various ways, several of which can be easily explored.

First, Rabelais' preparation for his stories and his manner of introducing them should reveal something about the importance which he attached to the stories and the roles which he assigned them in his work. In this case, not only is there a sharp distinction between the early and the late books, but equally, though from a slightly different point of view, between Books III and IV. The stories of Book IV are almost all characterized by a very particular, and often very painstaking, build-up. They are related by subject matter to the narrative, usually illustrative of a point under discussion; but besides that, they tend to be asked for specifically by one of the characters. Rabelais' method here is simple enough in principle: the person who wants to tell a story makes a provocative remark which is fairly sure to evoke from his listener a direct invitation for the story, or at the very least a question the answer to which requires the story. Thus, when Frère Jean, explaining his avoidance of the kissing ceremony on the Isle of Cheli, says that he fears the same thing might happen to him as once happened to the Seigneur de Guyercharois, Pantagruel quite naturally asks, "Quoy?" and Jean kindly tells the story (IV, 10). Or when Panurge says, "Contre tel inconvenient . . . je scay un remede tresbon, duquel usoit le seigneur de Basché," Pantagruel inevitably responds with the inviting "Quel?" which elicits the Basché story (IV, 12).

This type of introduction, even in the simple form suggested by these two examples, implies some forethought on the author's part. Knowing that he wants to tell a story, he has a character create a demand for it;

3. In this respect as in many others, Book V is a case apart. Since what it has to offer is slight and easily dealt with, I shall include it in the discussion where it is appropriate. From the standpoint of narrative, Book V warrants separate and detailed comment, which, however, I reserve for another occasion.

he then tells his tale in response to an invitation and with a certain amount of fanfare. In the case of Priapus' dog and fox tale (IV, Prol.), not only is the story preceded by Jupiter's inviting "Quoy? . . . Quand? Qui estoient-ilz? Où feut-ce?"—his obliging response to Priapus' suggestion that Jupiter handle the Galland-Ramus controversy as he once handled the case of a certain dog and fox—but Priapus' suggestion in turn is preceded by a remark of Jupiter's in which he "happens" to compare Ramus and Galland to a dog and a fox, and then asks Priapus to suggest a way of liquidating the controversy. The forethought here is of a relatively high order, everything from Jupiter's first reference to fox and dog being part of Rabelais' preparation for the story. The announcement of a story to come is elaborate, and in this case, even more than in the other two, the awareness of the characters that a story is about to be told is clear—and who is a better prepared listener than one who has specifically asked for a story? Indeed, Rabelais sometimes carefully gathers his audience together and tells them to sit (or stand) and listen. Priapus has a distinct, ready-made, and highly responsive audience of gods and goddesses, and Panurge, in his trick on Dindenault, has very consciously and carefully invited his audience to listen and watch.

Not all the stories are presented with this kind of build-up. Two stories are brought in with formality but without any attempt (in the introduction, at any rate) to connect them with the narrative as a whole. They are presented simply as stories worth hearing. Such is the case in the story of Villon's revenge, told by Basché, who gathers his audience together, gives them drink, and then tells his tale: "Basché . . . manda querir sa femme, ses damoiselles, tous ses gens; feist apporter vin . . . , beut avecques eulx en grande alaigresse, puis leur dist . . ." (IV, 13). Such is also the case in V, 7, where one evening Panurge says to Editus, "Seigneur, ne vous desplaie, si je vous raconte une histoire joyeuse." But all the stories in Book IV (as well as the lone story of Book V), whether with or without build-up, are brought in with a consciousness—on the part of author, reader, teller, and listener—which seldom appears in the earlier books, or when it does appear, is of a lesser order and is an exception. The stories of Book IV, distinguished by their build-ups from those of Book III, have in common with the latter a fairly consistent relevance to the plot or to the discussion of the larger narrative, though they are not part of it as the stories of Books I and II are. (The fact that the stories which are least related to the main plot—Villon and the horse-ass—are in Books IV and V may be another indication of Rabelais' growing boldness after 1546, the date of Book III.) All the stories in Book III and most of the stories in Book IV are of the "à propos" variety. Ordinarily, a character, or Rabelais, announces that, apropos of the matter in hand, he is reminded of the fol-

lowing story. Sometimes he says this in so many words: "Je ne seray hors de propous, si je vous raconte. . . ." (Pantagruel, telling the Rotisserie story, III, 37); "Il me souvient à ce propous (dist Bridoye continuant). . . ." (telling about Perrin Dendin, III, 41); "Il me souvient. . . ." (Bridoye, beginning the tale of the Gascon warrior, III, 42); "A propos de soubhaictz mediocres en matiere de coingnée. . . , je vous raconteray. . . ." (Rabelais, introducing Couillatris and his hatchet, IV, Prol.).

Sometimes these "à propos" stories are introduced as having real action-relevance to the narrative, either arising from or affecting actual happenings, or pointing (usually farcically, of course) to the solution of a problem which the characters may be facing. Thus we find in III, 28, on the problem of wives' infidelity: "Je te veux, dist frere Jan, enseigner un expedient. . . . Prens . . . l'anneau de Hans Carvel"; in IV, 12, on the problem of dealing with subpoena-servers: "Contre tel inconvenient, dist Panurge, je sçay un remede tresbon, duquel usoit le seigneur de Basché"; and in the prologue to Book IV, on the problem of liquidating the Ramus-Galland quarrel: "Puis que l'un vous comparez à un chien aboyant, l'autre à un fin freté renard. . . ." Frère Jean's story of Guyercharois' lady-kissing fiasco, though not a problem-solver, has close relevance to the action, being Jean's reason for avoiding the kissing ceremony at the court of Cheli: "Vous parlez de baiser damoiselles? par le digne et sacre froc que je porte, volontiers je m'en deporté, craignant que m'advieigne ce que advint au seigneur de Guyercharois" (IV, 10). (It was presumably that unhappy incident which moved him to hide out while his companions freely kissed the court ladies; but might we not also suspect that he avoided the ceremony so as to be able to tell the story? It is a possibility, but the evidence of forethought and build-up is not as conclusive as in the cases referred to previously.) It may be noted that in Book III, the talking-book *par excellence*, the connections tend to be with the *subject* under discussion rather than with *happenings*. The stories are more conversation-motivated than event-motivated: the Areopagite story proves the difficulty of deciding cases fairly, thus justifying decisions by dice-throwing; the pope-nuns story illustrates the undependability of women, etc.

In Books I and II, since almost all the stories are parts of the whole giant-novel, the tendency is for them to begin with some variation of "One day." In *Gargantua*, 25, we have "En cestuy temps," in *Pantagruel*, 6 and 9, "Quelque jour" and "Un jour." Sometimes Rabelais connects his story to the longer narrative without introduction: *Pantagruel*, 3, 21, and *Gargantua*, 18. The Pilgrims-eaten-in-a-salad story has an "à propos" introduction ("Le propos requiert que recontons ce qu'advint à six pelerins"); the Lion-Fox story is the one case in these two books of an excellent problem-solving story, the solution to the problem of flies on

the female wall being offered; the Escape from the Turks is the one example of the type of build-up which was to become common in Book IV, but here with a faulty execution which has no parallel in Book IV. Pantagruel's "Mais or me dictes comment vous eschappastes leurs mains" is, as we have seen, in response to Panurge's untrue "je leur contoys comment ces diables de Turcs sont bien malheureux de ne boire goutte de vin," transparently his way of manoeuvring Pantagruel into inviting the story. Surely in this last case Rabelais did not succeed with his build-up as he was to succeed later. Indeed the introductions to the stories in the late books show altogether greater variety and growing finesse, whether the stories are designed to integrate with the total action or to be extras, with or without obvious connection to the whole.

Our discussion would be misleading, however, without specific mention of Chapters 6 and 9 of *Pantagruel*, where Rabelais shows that, even in this first of his books, his introductions are not devoid of conscious and successful planning. In the first of these chapters Pantagruel meets the Limousin student who murders the French language, and in the second he meets his companion-to-be, Panurge. Many parallels and contrasts show that these chapters are intended as a pair, the more so as the one follows the other almost immediately in the narrative, being separated mainly by the enumeration of the books in the library of St. Victor and the text of Gargantua's letter to his son. The introductions are not the smallest factor pointing to a pairing of the two chapters. In Chapter 6 we read: "Quelque jour, je ne sçay quand, Pantagruel se pourmenoit après soupper avec ses compaignons, par la porte dont l'on va à Paris; là rencontra un escolier tout joliet, qui venoit par icelluy chemin," and in Chapter 9: "Un jour Pantagruel, se pourmenant hors de la ville, vers l'abbaye saint Antoine, devisant et philosophant avecques ses gens et aulcuns escoliers, rencontra un homme beau de stature et elegant en tous lineamens du corps, mais pitoyablement navré en divers lieux." It is impossible, reading the second, to be unmindful of the first, and thus Rabelais enhances immeasurably the effectiveness of the linguistic game which he will be playing in these two chapters.

Surely, then, Rabelais was not lacking in story-telling skill in Books I and II, but it appears, from the number of independent stories and from his manner of presenting them, that he put more emphasis on them in his late than in his early books. It might logically be argued that the difference in introductions is not a function of his changing interest or manner but merely an accident of the fact that almost all the stories in Books I and II are "integrals" whereas almost all in Books III and IV are "extras," and that in all probability, if he had used more extras in I and II they would have been introduced in ways not unlike what we have in III and IV. Within limits, this is likely, but it is sig-

nificant that, having in his early period a fair enough skill at detached stories and introductions to them, he made little use of it, preferring instead to make his narrations part of the whole. Added to the fact that in Books III and IV the total number of stories is considerably greater than in Books I and II, this would seem to point to the hypothesis that in his late period Rabelais had come to regard himself, more than before, as a teller of short tales.

II

We can most directly test this hypothesis by looking at another group of short narrations—for what I have been calling “stories” are limited in number, and their selection is, after all, arbitrary. Whatever one’s personal preference, there is no doubt that in his briefer narrations, above all in his anecdotes, Rabelais is also a story-teller, and to speculate that he more and more came to consider himself a teller of short tales requires an examination of the anecdotes. The examination may be fruitful, for the anecdotes, sprinkled through the five books, are more numerous than the “stories” and may give more indication of a drift, if drift there be.

To be sure, it is difficult to say precisely what is a story and what an anecdote, and at the other extreme, what is an anecdote and what a mere reference or allusion. By and large, an anecdote does not command the same attention as a full-fledged story, is shorter, takes its material from the lives and experiences of famous historical personages, and is not enriched with details or with conversation; on the other hand, it does tell enough to be appreciated by a reader or listener without prior knowledge, whereas a mere allusion usually presupposes such prior knowledge. The lines are not easily drawn, but the difference in the volume of anecdotal material between the early and the late books is so vast as to be virtually unaffected by the great number of border-line cases.

By my own count, *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* contain two anecdotes each: the *bissac* tale and the explanation of the shortness of French leagues in *Pantagruel* (Chs. 15 and 23), and the Philip-Alexander case and the milk-pitcher story in *Gargantua* (Chs. 14 and 33). By approximately the same standards, Book III contains twelve anecdotes and Book IV twenty-six. Book V, of which surely not more than a part was written by Rabelais, if we are to believe the many indications which have been adduced, contains one. A list of the anecdotes follows:

Pantagruel (Book II)

1. Bissac (15)
2. The shortness of French leagues (23)

Gargantua (Book I)

1. Philip and Alexander (14)
2. The milk-pitcher (33)

Book III

1. Ptolemy and the camel (Prol.)
2. The close-mindedness of Alexander (16)
3. The flaying of men by women (18)
4. Nero and the actor (19)
5. Verona's mistake (19)
6. Dodin and the friar (23)
7. Cupid and the Muses (31)
8. Hippocrates' distrust of his wife (32)
9. The cure for freezing vines (33)
10. The remedy for cuckoldry (33)
11. The man who married a dumb wife (34)
12. Caesar and the non-inflammable wood (52)

Book IV

1. Julia's thin dress (Epistle)
2. Zaccheus (Prol.)
3. The hatchet in the Jordan (Prol.)
4. The wishers of Paris (Prol.)
5. The shame of Furnius (4)
6. No cook-shops in Florence (11)
7. Antigonus and Antagoras (11)
8. Breton and the Duc de Guise (11)
9. L. Neratius' expensive blows (16)
10. The death of Aeschylus (17)
11. The laughing death of Philemon (17)
12. Herod's stratagem (26)
13. Darius and the Scythians (34)
14. Alexander at Tyre (37)
15. The death of Pompey (37)
16. Aemilius Paulus and his daughter (37)
17. Cicero and the ensigns of Pompey (39)
18. The conditions of Frederick Barbarossa (45)
19. God's lucky leg (50)
20. The tailor and the *Supplements* (52)
21. The archery match at Cahusac (52)
22. The wisdom of Diogenes (52)
23. The wedding of Jean Delif (52)
24. The silent message of Tarquin (63)
25. The constipation of Messer Pandolfo (67)
26. King Edward's French laxative (67)

Book V

1. The Canonicals of the Abbé Castilliers (17)

In number, the anecdotes show the same tendency as the stories, but in more pronounced form. Whereas the number of stories from book to book was 6-3-7-8-1, the anecdotes appear as 2-2-12-26-1; or, combining the first two books on the one hand and III and IV on the other, and disregarding Book V, we get: stories, 9-15; anecdotes, 4-38. Not only does the mere number of anecdotes bear out what we found in surveying the stories, so also does their degree of attachment to the whole narrative. Here the range cannot be as great as in the case of the stories, for it is the nature of anecdotes to be illustrative of a point under discussion; but within the limits imposed by the form, the differences are significant. Panurge's *bissac* tale connects closely with the question of the cheapness of women's privy parts; his explanation of the shortness of French leagues is in answer to a question by Pantagruel as they are walking along. Grandgousier's Philip-Alexander anecdote is prompted by his observation of Gargantua's marvellous understanding; and Echephron's pitcher tale is a result of the imaginary conquests which have just been described. All in Books I and II are close to the narrative. Some of the anecdotes of Books III and IV, by contrast, are tied to the point by a thin, almost imperceptible thread: Panurge's account of the cure for freezing vines, Epistemon's résumé of the man who married a dumb wife, and Rhizotome's rather dull (but really not totally unconnected) Jean Delif tale. These anecdotes are so different from anything in Books I and II that it may be revealing to look at their connections and contexts in some detail.

Of the three, the Jean Delif anecdote seems to fit least snugly into its context, and if we read the pages preceding it, we quickly discover why: it is the last in a succession of anecdotes. In an outburst against the *Decretals* and related books, Rabelais first has Frère Jean tell of the harmful effects resulting from a certain obscene use which he once made of a page of the *Clementines*, whereupon, after several more derogatory references, Carpalim tells of the tailor who was ruined because he used pages of the *Clementines* for patterns. This leads Gymnaste to tell of the archery match at Cahusac, where, because the target had been made of pages of the *Decretals*, not one of the very skilled archers managed to hit home. The archery story now brings Pantagruel to tell of Diogenes, who, seeking safety from the arrows of a poor archer, planted himself at the center of the target, as the only place which the archer was certain to miss. This tale is connected with the preceding by virtue of the archery motif but has nothing to do with the *Decretals*. Finally comes Rhizotome's account of the harmful effects of using pages of the *Sixième*, which is in reality close to the starting-point of the series but has lost its force because of the intervention of the Diogenes story. It is the Diogenes anecdote which is furthest from the starting-point and the Delif tale

which takes us back to it, but the Diogenes story has the virtue of being related to the anecdote which precedes it, whereas the Delif wedding has only the more remote connection with the starting-point.

The apparent removal of the Delif tale from the main stream comes, then, in an immediate sense, from the intervention of the Diogenes story; but in principle it comes from the fact that, instead of a simple point with a single anecdote to illustrate it, we have here a whole series of anecdotes. Panurge's cure for freezing vines, though opposite in its connections, shows the same principle. It is an interruption in Rondibilis' remedy for cuckoldry and is related to something in Rondibilis' tale rather than to the central point being discussed, just as the Diogenes anecdote had to do with archery rather than with the *Decretals*.

There are other examples of such series of anecdotes, sometimes, moreover, intertwined with what we have chosen to call full-fledged stories. The sole case of this in Books I and II is that of the *bissac*, which immediately follows the story of the fox and the lion, but there the anecdote is single. In Book III, Chapter 19, Panurge's Verona closely follows Pantagruel's Nero, both being designed to show the efficacy of gestures in lieu of words; and we have already mentioned the freezing vines. Book IV contains four series, besides the case of the *Decretals*. In the Prologue the question of moderation in making wishes connects all three of the anecdotes and the longer Couillatris story; in Chapter 11 the three anecdotes deal with men's interest in kitchens; in Chapter 17 the death of Aeschylus and the death of Philemon are among a long recital of strange deaths; in Chapter 37 all three anecdotes are examples of divination by names; and in Chapter 67 both the Pandolfo and the Villon-King Edward anecdotes deal with cures for constipation. Thus, of the twelve anecdotes in Book III, four (nos. 4-5, 9-10) appear in series of two each; of the twenty-six anecdotes in Book IV, fully seventeen appear in groups: one series of four anecdotes, three series of three, and two series of two (nos. 2-3-4, 6-7-8, 10-11, 14-15-16, 20-21-22-23, 25-26).

Rabelais' growing tendency to present his anecdotes in clusters, along with the increasing number of anecdotes, is a not inconsiderable indication of a growing preoccupation with these short pieces. But statistical evidence is reinforced by the related, and more organic, consideration of the situations in which the anecdotes are told, a matter which has already been touched upon but which may now be examined more fully, both for the anecdotes and the stories.

III

It has already been observed that the stories and anecdotes in the first two books are more closely tied to the large narrative than in Books

III and IV. The short narrations, whether it be a case of French leagues or of a nasty trick played on a reluctant lady of Paris, are so systematically connected with the novelistic flow that, though it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that frequently Rabelais desired nothing so much as to deliver himself of a good yarn, his consistency in integrating them into his larger structure would almost appear as a matter of policy. We are not told to take time out from the principal entertainment to enjoy a little story, nor are the characters. On occasion, it is true, once a show is under way, the perpetrator rounds up his friends or passers-by to share in the diversion, as when Panurge, having arranged for the dogs to befoul his late lady-love, invites Pantagruel to watch the show ("à quoy volontiers consentit Pantagruel, et veit le mystere, qu'il trouva fort beau et nouveau"). But clear-cut digressions, planned and arranged as such from the start, do not occur.

How different is the staging in Books III and IV! Here all the stories but one are frankly *told*, and that one, the Dindenault episode, is carefully *staged*.⁴ Everything in the manner of presentation points to the conscious creation of a story-telling atmosphere. We have, first, the fact that Rabelais' role as narrator changes sharply. In Books I and II he allows his characters to tell only the four anecdotes and two of the stories (Panurge tells them both), for a total of six narrations, whereas he himself tells seven. In Books III and IV, he tells but fifteen (four stories and eleven anecdotes), while the characters tell thirty-seven (eleven stories and twenty-six anecdotes).

Nor do these quantitative differences convey the full impact of the changed tone. In the prologues to Books I and II, for example, Rabelais speaks, informally and lightly, to his readers, promising them good story-fare but actually telling little. There is no suggestion of an actual get-together with his readers—whether they be "tres illustres et tres chevaleureux champions, gentilz hommes et aultres" or "beuveurs tres illustres, et Verolez tres precieux." His questions, of which there are many here, as in every part of Rabelais, are either rhetorical or else addressed in the last analysis to himself. The impression is that he is talking at, not to, his readers.

In the Prologues to Books III and IV, on the other hand, there is

4. The stage-like quality of some of Rabelais' episodes has been pointed out recently by D. B. Wyndham Lewis (*Doctor Rabelais* [London and New York, 1957]) and mentioned by Jourda (*Le Gargantua de Rabelais*, p. 159). Many readers have, of course, been aware, in general, of the oral quality of Rabelais' writing, e.g., Pierre Villey: "Sa phrase—on l'a souvent indiqué—est une phrase parlée. Vous lui ôtez beaucoup de sa valeur expressive si vous ne la prononcez pas à haute voix. . . . L'auteur s'adresse personnellement au lecteur, il le prend à partie, il le questionne, il le harcèle, tout comme ferait un charlatan sur la foire" (*Marot et Rabelais*, 1923, p. 312). Plattard writes to much the same effect in *La Vie et l'œuvre de Rabelais* (Paris, 1939), p. 117.

both a great amount of story-telling and of talk to an actual group assembled to enjoy drink and conversation. The "bonnes gens, beuveurs tres illustres, et vous goutteux tres precieux" of Book III are repeatedly urged to take another gulp, and Rabelais himself pauses for a drink from time to time, and the tale of Diogenes and his tub, the *pièce de résistance* of this Prologue, is heralded as a good story worth listening to: "Si n'en avez ouy parler, de luy vous veulx presentement une histoire narrer, pour entrer en vin (beuvez doncques) et propous (escoutez doncques),..." Similarly, the Prologue to Book IV creates a lively atmosphere from the start when Rabelais tells his listeners to wait a moment till he puts on his spectacles so as to see them; it contains (though rather less than the Book III Prologue) drinking exhortations, and, above all, it has perhaps the most concentrated story-telling in all of Rabelais' books.⁵

Villey, who, with others, long ago pointed out the oral quality of Rabelais' style in general, did not take account of these sharp differences, except to note that Book III is a steady "comédie dialoguée." More recently, Henri Lefebvre well expressed the matter in the following terms: "S'il ignore la séparation des genres (prose et poésie), et celle du subjectif et de l'objectif, Rabelais ignore aussi celle du style écrit et du style parlé. Il écrit comme il pense et il pense comme il parle. Il n'a pas besoin d'un effort pour retrouver le rythme de la parole. Par conséquent l'art et la spontanéité ne se dissocient pas chez lui. La fraîcheur du langage et de la conversation populaires deviennent sans effort plénitude" (*Rabelais* [Paris, 1955], pp. 264-65). But it seems questionable whether the explanation of the oral nature of Rabelais' prose lies, as Lefebvre says, in the fact that written and oral were not yet distinguished: "La communication est encore principalement orale et directe. Le temps des conteurs et des trouvères n'est pas tellement loin, ni celui des chants épiques. Style écrit et style parlé ne se distinguent pas" (p. 27). My own examination rather points to a growth on Rabelais' part toward an oral style, toward more story-telling, and toward a synthesis of the two: stories in a live setting, using oral devices. Lefebvre's emphasis on oral style is, furthermore, emasculated by his characterization of Rabelais as a "romancier" more than a "conteur," a characterization which does not take full account of the differences between the early and the late books (pp. 257-58).

5. Rabelais' increased interest in presenting his material in a life-like, oral manner is sometimes clear from changes which he made after his first version. That he moved in this direction may be seen in changes made in his early books, as well as in a comparison of the early and late books. Thus, at one point in *Pantagruel*, Ch. 4, he first wrote: "Voicy qu'il fist. Il essaya de rompre les chaines. . . ." In the 1534 edition he changed this to: "Que fist-il? Il essaya . . ." and in 1542 to: "Que fist-il? Qu'il fist, mes bonnes gens? Escoutez. Il essaya . . ."

The situations within the books themselves show the same variation as the prologues. In the two early books all the stories and anecdotes, whether actually part of the long narrative or not, are closely tied to it, whereas in the late books they tend to be presented in live story-telling sessions. Most significantly, the first two books show no sign of the "topping" setting which almost characterizes Books III and IV. The fact that, as we have seen, most of the anecdotes in Books III-IV appear in clusters (twenty-one out of thirty-eight) and that this is more true in Book IV than in Book III (seventeen out of twenty-eight, as against four out of twelve) is strong *prima facie* evidence of a movement toward both live story-telling situations and the topping technique. The stories, too, are more and more presented in conjunction with other stories or with anecdotes. In the first two books, only the Lion-Fox story is followed by an anecdote, but in Books III-IV the Diogenes story has the Ptolemy anecdote as a near neighbor (Prol.); the story of the Pope and the nuns (III, 34) is part of a complex of anecdotes extending from Chapter 31 through Chapter 34; the three stories regarding lawsuits, though in separate chapters (III, 41, 42, 44), are all told in the same setting with the same group of characters present; the Couillatris and the Dog-Fox stories are not only joined together, but are immediately preceded by two anecdotes and followed by another; the Basché and Villon stories (IV, 12-15) constitute a single story unit. And were we to analyze the hundreds of pieces which are less than either stories or anecdotes, we would almost certainly find the same movement toward clusters.

As for topping, of which there is little trace in the first two books, unless it be Rabelais topping himself, or Panurge on one occasion topping imaginary stories ("Les aultres mettent d'aultres raisons; mais celle-là me semble la meilleure," *Pant.*, 23), there are cases in Books III-IV where a character more or less clearly and frankly sets out to out-do the preceding tale, and others where the atmosphere authorizes us to think of the situation as plainly a story-telling session, not to mention indications of teller-audience interchange and response, provided by Rabelais as master of the whole. Topping requires a group, preferably a limited number of friends or associates, and in Books I-II Rabelais shows much less skill or inclination than later in bringing together such groups. Gargantua's dinner for Frère Jean and others (*Gar.*, 39-40) provides such a group, but, though the scene is animated, it produces no stories or anecdotes. On the other hand, Epistemon's account of the underworld (a description rather than a story) is told to a group, and there are marks of a story-telling setting, especially the questions from the audience and Pantagruel's "reserve-nous ces beaulx comptes à une aultre foys. Seulement dis-nous..." (*Pant.*, 30). But this is exceptional. More often there is either a large mass of people or a pair. Where the

group is small, it is too often composed of "ses gouvernants" (*Garg.*, 14) or "ses compagnons" (*Pant.*, 6), and though stories or anecdotes are told, they have little chance of fructifying in such vague and indeterminate company.

By contrast, Books III and IV are dominated by the small group. This is most obvious in Book III, which is principally a series of small gatherings in which Panurge and his friends consult Herr Trippa, Rondibilis, the Sibyl, the Theologian, et al., and have private discussions both before and after the consultations; but it is as true of Book IV, where the island-hopping and the sometimes large crowds serve in reality as little more than a back-drop for the small gatherings, in which story-telling is a major activity.

Perhaps the clearest case of a conscious story-telling session is that in Book IV, Chapter 11, where Epistemon's "Vrayement vous me reduisez en memoire ce que je veidz et ouy en Florence" is followed by Pantagruel's "Me soubvient avoir leu que Antigonus . . .," which in turn is followed by Panurge's statement that he will "crown" Pantagruel's tale: "Je dameray ceste cy, vous racontant ce que Breton Villandry respondit un jour au seigneur duc de Guyse." And the close of the chapter, though it provides necessary continuity for the longer narrative, leaves little doubt that it has been the series of yarns, and not anything on the island, that has been of major interest to both Rabelais and us: "En ces menuz devis arriverent en leurs navires. Et plus long sejour ne feirent en icelle isle de Cheli." The whole group of tales is introduced, in life-like fashion, by Frère Jean's question: "Que signifie . . . que tousjours vous trouvez moines en cuysines?" Rabelais' practice here, it may be noted, is to have the characters take turns telling stories, a faithful imitation of a real situation, where broad participation is one of the measures of success.

There is, moreover, considerable animation in the story sessions achieved by characters taking an interest in one another and in characters of the stories—short story and long thus becoming happily integrated. In the prelude to Frère Jean's lady-kissing story, after he has announced the subject and the main character, Pantagruel says: "Quoy? je le congnos; il est de mes meilleurs amis" (IV, 10), which, though news to us, is an excellent touch to build interest. The summary of the man who married a dumb wife is prefaced with Pantagruel's telling Rondibilis that he has not seen him since he witnessed the performance of that "morale comoedie" in which Rondibilis appeared in company with various other actors, including François Rabelais. It turns out, of course, that Epistemon was there also, and so he tells the story of the play (III, 34). The same technique occurs—though, for variety, after rather than before the stories—when Bridoye has finished his two tales which prove

the value of delay in making decisions. It suddenly appears that Frère Jean was an old acquaintance of Perrin Dendin and that Epistemon had been in the very tent of the Chevalier de Cressé when the Gascon gave his answer to the mercenary (III, 43). The same kind of connection between short-story and frame is achieved in the devil-farmer story, when we learn that the date set for the scratching match is precisely the day that our characters arrive on the island. Moreover, at the very moment that the first part of the story is being told, news comes that the farmer's wife has bested the devil; it remains only to tell how (IV, 47).

In somewhat similar vein, illustrative of Rabelais' attempt to build live story sessions, we may mention Pantagruel's suggestion to Frère Jean that "Quand telz contes vous nous ferez, soyez records d'apporter un bassin. Peu s'en fault que ne rende ma guorge" (IV, 50)—a type of remark not unknown in real gatherings of acquaintances exchanging stories. An opposite reaction occurs in the prologue to Book IV, where the gods and goddesses "s'eclatèrent de rire, comme un microcosme de mouches." But, favorably or unfavorably, the audiences react, and we are keenly aware that story sessions are in progress. Phrases like "Telle maniere de prognostiquer par noms n'est moderne," "Voyez comment les Pythagoriens," "Vrayment, j'en veids l'experience à Xaintes," "Consyderez comment Alexandre le Grand," "Au rebours, consyderez comment," etc., succeeding one another with rapidity and each introducing a yarn of some kind (IV, 37), leave no doubt that time out has been called for light conversation and story-telling while the group is awaiting developments. And this is a phenomenon that occurs increasingly toward the end of Book IV.

IV

I have said that the frequent occurrence of stories and anecdotes in clusters provides considerable evidence of the live story situation in Book III and especially in Book IV. A further technique, closely related to this, is the story-within-a-story, the acme of the live situation. In real life this may take three forms: (a) one person breaking into another's story to tell one of his own; (b) a character in a story "interrupting" to tell another story; and (c) the teller breaking into his own story with a second, usually subsidiary, tale. In Books III and IV Rabelais has examples of all three forms, and though in number the cases are not themselves convincing, when taken in conjunction with the other evidences we have had, they give fair indication of the direction in which our author has been moving. Panurge's cure for freezing vines (III, 33) is a case of type (a). It is an interruption in Rondibilis' story—surely not politely brought in, but exactly the kind of thing which occurs in gath-

erings of inveterate story-tellers. The Prologue to Book IV provides a case of type (b): Rabelais' story (Couillatris and the hatchets) is interrupted not only by various topical discussions but also by Priapus' Fox-Dog story in connection with one of these discussions. The Villon story (IV, 13), like Priapus' Fox-Dog, is a case of (b), a character within a story (here Basché) taking time out to tell others within the story a subsidiary tale; but since Panurge is telling the whole story, this might also be regarded as a case of (c), Panurge breaking into his own story with another. The clearest example of (c) is the Bringuénarilles tale (IV, 17), with its Aeschylus insertion and the insertions within the Aeschylus insertion, all told by Rabelais.

To what extent these stories-within-stories came spontaneously to Rabelais as he wrote and to what extent he inserted them after a first draft because they enhanced the live story-telling atmosphere, we can only speculate. Panurge's cure for freezing vines looks like an insertion after the fact, for there is no trace of connective material either before or after it; Rondibilis goes on exactly as though no one had interrupted him. On the other hand, the interruptions in the Book IV Prologue seem to have been composed at the same time as the Couillatris story. The latter tale is difficult to read without the interruptory material. Jupiter's "Ça, ça, descendez presentement là-bas, et jetez..." by no means picks up the "... que ceste coignée soit rendue. Qu'il n'en soit plus parlé" which preceded Priapus' philological interruption. Nor can the Fox-Dog story, or in general the gods-council scene of which it is a part, be easily detached from the hatchet story; Rabelais almost surely wrote all or most of this at the same time.

As for the Villon story (IV, 13), this looks like an insertion after the body of the Basché story was written. If all of Chapter 13 were omitted, the Basché story (12, 14, 15) would scarcely suffer in any way comparable to the effect of leaving portions of the gods-council scene out of the Couillatris story. Basché's briefing of his servants and his assignment of roles for the coming brawl (beginning and end of Ch. 13) might have been in the first draft, but it seems most probable that the Villon story itself was added later, for it shows no organic connection with the frame.

More clear is the account of the death of Aeschylus and others (IV, 17). Here is a whole complex of short narrations inserted in the midst of the report of Bringuénarilles' death. The latter, though it is basic and serves as the starting-point for all the others, is short: "Et estoit le noble Bringuénarilles à cestuy matin trespasé, en façon tant estrange que plus esbahir ne vous fault de la mort de Aeschylus. ... Le bon Bringuénarilles (hélas!) mourut estranglé, mangeant un coing de beurre frays à la gueule d'un four chaud, par l'ordonnance des medecins." These five lines on Bringuénarilles' death (in the Plattard edition) are inter-

rupted by two and one half pages of accounts of a dozen other strange deaths. How much is original and how much later insertion may be surmised from the structure of these pages.

Each strange death is introduced by a "plus de," parallelling the first "plus esbahir ne vous fault de la mort de Aeschylus." It seems likely, because of the dependent quality of the "plus de" introductions, that all or most of the accounts were written at one time. Certainly the "plus de" structure implies enumeration, and though Rabelais may have added a death or two later, the idea of an enumeration was probably there from the start.

In order for these truncated "plus de" examples to make sense, they must follow one another closely. With even one very long example, the thread could easily be lost and the meaning of "plus de" obscured. Almost all of them, of course, do occur in rapid succession—inevitably, since eleven deaths are recounted in a little over one page. Except for the paragraph on Philomenes, all the deaths are one sentence long. What is our surprise, therefore, to find more than a page intervening between the first "plus esbahir ne vous fault de la mort de Aeschylus" and the second appearance of the phrase: "Plus de Anacréon poëte." Nor is this due to the length of the Aeschylus account; though it is longer than the others, it occupies only a little more space than Philomenes and would probably not be enough, by itself, to break the continuity. The trouble lies in the things suggested by Aeschylus' death, i.e., various people's fear of falling bodies, which takes up almost twice as much space as Aeschylus. Then, when we come to "Plus de Anacréon poëte," we scarcely see the connection without going back to the beginning of the Aeschylus section.

It is easy to see Rabelais straying from his succession of strange deaths in order to expatiate on the fear of falling bodies; but if this had all been done in a single operation, he would not have assumed the second "plus de" to be adequate. He would have added something to make the connection clearer. Are the Aeschylus tale and the paragraphs on falling bodies, then, late insertions? The Aeschylus story is more likely an original, for by itself it does not destroy the "plus de" sequence. The falling bodies, however, looks like an insertion suggested by the death of Aeschylus, for it assuredly disconnects the "plus de" series in a way which we seldom find in Rabelais.

There is an informality, a liveliness, about these stories-within-stories which makes them one of the major factors in creating the live story situation. It is difficult to imagine how, short of writing a prologue on the subject, Rabelais could more plainly have told us that in Books III and IV it is the stories and anecdotes, and not the long narrative, which are to be the principal source of our pleasure and the special object of

his story-telling gifts. When we compare, for example, *Gargantua* to the *Tiers Livre*, we cannot escape the feeling that in the former he has given us a grand mixture of a sustained story and inspired short subject, whereas in the latter, still maintaining a frame, he has refused to let himself be dominated by the long narrative but has consciously realized his vocation as a teller of short tales.

THE PRINCE DE LIGNE AND DIDEROT

By Basil Guy

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

STUDDING THE BIOGRAPHY of Charles-Joseph, Prince de Ligne (1735-1814), a man who seems to have "collected" celebrities for many different reasons, are the names of Frederick the Great, Catherine II, Marie Antoinette, Napoleon, Madame de Staël, and Goethe, not to mention those of other men of letters, including Voltaire and Rousseau. Yet throughout his work there is a surprising and, we believe, significant lack of references to Diderot and his protean personality, as much in the flesh as in his writings. On the merely biographical level, a few words about the life of the Prince should help to explain this deficiency in part.

Born to one of the most ancient, noble, and wealthy houses of the Low Countries, de Ligne was early destined for a military career. This dedication served to nurture in him a tradition where "gloire" was the greatest consideration, obsessing and unique. Unfortunately, despite his persistent motivation by and for glory, the Prince de Ligne never really achieved this consecration of his life and labor—at least, not in matters military. Although he was engaged until roughly 1763 in the service of the House of Austria, especially during the Seven Years' War, the next twenty years saw his development and full flowering as a courtier, first at Vienna, then in France, where his birth and imperial connections worked in his favor and gave him an entrance to the intimate circles of Louis XVI and the youthful Marie Antoinette. Such friendships as he cultivated at Versailles did not prevent him from fostering others, less desirable socially, but intellectually more stimulating, particularly among the Paris intelligentsia, where the first disdainful opinion of him, uttered by Madame du Deffand, was soon belied by his many relations with men of letters both great and small. When, in 1779, his eldest son married a Polish noblewoman, the Prince made common cause with his daughter-in-law against Russian pretensions in the Eastern kingdom and undertook a voyage to the court of Catherine II, in the course of which he was chosen by the Semiramis of the North to replace Stanislaus-Augustus Poniatowski in her affections, although shortly thereafter he was defeated by his erstwhile rival in a bid for election to the Polish monarchy. After a brief interlude in Paris, the Prince, in 1787, was among the special guests who floated down the Dnieper with the Empress and Potemkin in their now-famous voyage to the Crimea. Once

they had reached the shores of the Black Sea, the Prince was honored in signal fashion by Catherine, with the grant of a large parcel of land near Yalta. From a purely literary point of view, the excursion marks perhaps the acme of the Prince's career, since to it we owe a series of evocative meditations, written as letters to a French correspondent and friend, the Marquise de Coigny. After such a rewarding experience, however, aught else would seem an anticlimax. And so it was. Although recalled to military service in the struggles of Joseph II against the Turks in Serbia, and although briefly involved in fighting against the French Revolution until 1794, the Prince's world had changed, was changing, even as he joined the émigrés in exile at Vienna following the Austrian defeat at Fleurus. As one of the remaining members of that species which had known, appreciated, and approved of Talleyrand's "douceur de vivre"—as one who could not and would not forget the Old Régime—the Prince de Ligne found himself, when past the prime of life, reduced to leading a precarious existence. Thus, the sudden glory which he knew in 1809, thanks to the publicity of his fellow-cosmopolitan Madame de Staël, was but the last glimmer of light for a life and for a way of life which came fully to a close in the midst of the Congress of Vienna. His career, while not "glorious" in the accepted sense of the term, was not, however, without those traits which contribute to true glory and of which the honorary title of *Feldmarschall*, awarded in 1804, represents but one facet, a final irony that completes the sketch, except for a word about the Prince's literary remains.

Despite the importance he attached to "gloire," the Prince de Ligne, after 1792, was truly past caring. In September of the last-named year, the Prince knew his one great sorrow, the death of his eldest son fighting against the French in the disastrous Argonne campaign. Yet so great a loss was not without its consolation in a life filled to the brim with pleasures and recognition of a sort. Compounded of sentiment and practical necessity, that consolation was to be found—for better or worse—in writing. True, the Prince had always been ready to indulge this weakness, but never to the degree which misfortune allowed or dictated. Much of the material in his thirty-four volumes of *Mélanges*, published from 1795 to 1811, derives from these circumstances, and to this unexpected source does the name of Charles-Joseph de Ligne owe whatever fame now attaches thereto.

Whether we approach the material in the manner of an André Billy or of an Arthur Wilson, the differences between the life of the Prince de Ligne and Diderot, the prince of letters, should be sufficiently great and obvious as to need little comment. Aside from their trips to Russia under the auspices of Catherine the Great and their passion for writing, there is indeed no comparison possible. Although it is true that "com-

paraison n'est pas raison," these two aspects of the topic provide more than sufficient material for our comprehension of the larger problems involved, for there is ever room for contrasts, just as, considering the twenty-two years' difference in age, there is room also for that vague and elusive, but nonetheless useful, criterion of "influence." And first of all, in the personal relations of the two men.

We do not know whether de Ligne met Diderot in the course of an early visit to Paris, perhaps in 1759. Such an encounter is quite unlikely in any case, because at that time, the Prince was acting as official emissary from the Empress Maria Theresa, and, so far as we know, was concerned only with making his way in court circles. More probably, de Ligne met Diderot during his stay in the French capital from 1763 to 1765. At that time, the Prince was in his late twenties, Diderot in his fifties; the Prince's tastes were becoming ever more cosmopolitan, allowing him to prefer the delights of the salons to the moribund etiquette of the court, while Diderot's renown, at least as a publicist of great talent, was certainly well-established. Although contemporary records of such a meeting are wanting, they may have met at Helvétius' salon or around d'Holbach's table, whether in Paris or at Le Grandval. Except in one instance, the specific nature and location of their encounter(s) are not mentioned by the otherwise gossipy Prince. Somewhat exasperatingly, de Ligne lumps Diderot together with other writers of the day in the *Fragments de l'histoire de ma vie*, saying merely, "J'ai vu Diderot, d'Alembert, Thomas, Buffon, La Harpe, Marmontel, Mairan, le président Hénault et tous les académiciens chez lui à diner" (I:167). We should note in passing that the section containing this fleeting reference continues, "J'ai beaucoup vécu avec. . . J'ai connu. . ." These incipits are perhaps indicative of a nice gradation in the Prince's mind and judgment, showing not only the degree of familiarity which obtained in his relationships, but also the relative esteem in which he held many contemporary writers. More especially should we note that the entire passage begins with a sort of caveat which runs, "Legros, mon secrétaire, est le seul homme de lettres qui n'ait pas d'inconvénient. Il a tous les talents aimables et les qualités utiles." This brief aside to the Prince's mistrust or, rather, disdain, of men of letters should not shock us, despite his reputation as hail-fellow-well-met where collecting celebrities was concerned. Anecdotal appreciations notwithstanding, the Prince de Ligne remained conscious of his caste to the end of his life.

The more so after his visits to Russia, where Catherine the Great was not averse to bolstering his superiority complex, especially in regard to writers. For instance, the Empress is said by de Ligne to have attacked the pretentiousness of La Harpe, taken as representative of all men of letters, in the following blunt fashion: "M. de La Harpe va apprendre

à Monseigneur [le Tsarévitch] à régner . . . , MM. les gens de lettres n'entendent rien à gouverner." To which her interlocutor, not to be outdone by such perspicacity (or else still smarting from the "benefits" procured by the French Revolution when he recalled the incident as he wrote around 1803), was quick to rejoin, "ce qui n'a été que trop prouvé depuis ce temps-là" (*Mél.*, XXVII, 6). In his work on Diderot and Catherine II, Maurice Tourneux seems to have discounted tales of Russian dissatisfaction with the "philosophes" (*Diderot et Catherine II* [Paris, 1899], pp. 74-81), but when we reflect on the non sequitur of Diderot's visit to the imperial court, the words of the Prince de Ligne almost force us to discount the usual picture of the enthusiastic philosopher slapping the knee of a somewhat startled Catherine during their interviews. Although direct references to Diderot's visit of 1775 are wanting in the works of the Prince, we may, without unduly tipping the scales against the philosopher, invoke the testimony of one of de Ligne's boon companions who represents almost as well as he the "official," aristocratic point of view, the Count de Ségur.

The relations of the French ambassador with the Empress had been intimate enough to allow him the privilege of recounting certain details of Catherine's conversations with him. Among these, Ségur devotes several pages of his memoirs (Ségur, Louis Philippe, comte de, *Mémoires*. . . [Paris, 1827] 3rd ed.) to the Empress' impression of Diderot. And that impression was distinctly unfavorable. "Je m'entretins longtemps et souvent avec lui, me disait Catherine, mais avec plus de curiosité que de profit. Si je l'avais cru, tout aurait été bouleversé dans mon empire. . . . Cependant, comme je l'écoutais plus que je ne parlais, un témoin qui serait survenu nous aurait pris tous deux, lui pour un sévère pédagogue et moi pour son humble écolière. Probablement il le crut lui-même, car au bout de quelque temps, voyant qu'il ne s'opérait dans mon gouvernement aucune des grandes innovations qu'il m'avait conseillées, il m'en montra sa surprise avec une sorte de fierté mécontente. . . ." (III, 47). Ségur's prejudicial reporting ends with Catherine's well-known quip, "Vous ne travaillez que sur le papier . . . tandis que moi, pauvre impératrice, je travaille sur la peau humaine. . . ." (III, 48). For all its stylization and possible inaccuracy, this narrative does lead us to suspect that because of the similarity between Ségur's approach to Diderot and that of the Prince de Ligne to writers in general, it was ultimately thanks to the Empress herself that the Prince was confirmed in his caviling attitude toward the philosopher—one that, playing on his inherently aristocratic traits, strengthened him in his belief in their superiority over the plebeian characteristics of a Diderot while yet deepening his expressed animosity toward the latter on other, idealistic grounds. For, although his familiarity with Diderot the man was super-

ficial—to say the least—the Prince's knowledge of Diderot's ideas, based on a very thorough acquaintance with his works, was extensive. And that, despite the modesty with which he admits to having read only the *Bijoux indiscrets*, *Le Père de famille*, and "son excellent traité d'éducation publique" (*Mél.*, XXIX, 28).

It would appear, then, that none of the Prince's remarks about Diderot was written before his first visit to Russia in 1780. But de Ligne's attitude was already formed, or had at least germinated, while awaiting the impetus supplied by Catherine II to become fixed. In a fragment from his *Ecarts*, we find witness to the slight esteem in which, from the beginning, the Prince had held the *Encyclopédie* and its directors, among whom we must include Diderot. "Le Dictionnaire encyclopédique et les Encyclopédistes qui l'ont cru et qui se sont annoncés pour cela, m'ont paru, dans le temps que toute l'Europe qui voulait faire la spirituelle en était folle, le comble de la bêtise et de l'impertinence" (*Mél.*, XXIV, 23). Lest we be tempted to complain that when writing these lines the Prince was merely reflecting a reactionary attitude inspired by the French Revolution, we should remember that despite the frivolousness of his existence, de Ligne had ever been a firm believer in Roman Catholicism, even when the flesh was apparently most weak. His devil-may-care attitude was not, however, the last step in that race toward futility which has made at least M. Hellens consider the Prince as one of those existentialists before the fact who now seem to encumber some histories of literature. (Cf. *NRF*, XXXIX, 431-41.)

He who felt attracted both to Voltaire and to Rousseau because he saw that to be a social success it was important to gain some recognition from the intelligentsia, never did despair of winning each of these giants to his way of thinking, especially in matters of religion. (Cf. his visits to both as related in the *Mélanges*, volume X.) Thus it is important to note that if sometimes Diderot is quoted pell-mell with Voltaire for completeness or effect (*Mél.*, XXVII, 205), his name is more frequently associated with de Ligne's favorite scapegoats for the ills of the world, the Encyclopedists, and especially with d'Alembert, as the following reflection in the *Ecarts posthumes* testifies: "Diderot et d'Alembert sont ennuyeux dès qu'ils parlent religion . . ." (p. 26). But Diderot's ideas on religion provoked more than "boredom" or even "annoyance" where this eloquent defender of the establishment was concerned. More than personal antipathy, there entered into play doctrinal conviction, and the philosopher was taken to task as a freethinker and atheist. For example, when writing his commentary on La Harpe's *Lycée*, de Ligne remarks: "Diderot et lui [La Harpe] ont tort de vouloir faire argumenter sur des preuves métaphysiques de la religion. Qu'on croie. Cela vaut mieux. Et qu'on ne s'ennuie pas à lire les ennuyeux paradoxes blasphé-

matoires de l'un et les réfutations pédantes et lourdes de l'autre" (*Mél.*, XXIX, 29). All of these judgments, it should be pointed out, are mitigated in some degree by the Prince's opening statements in this section, where, after seeking to excuse the impiousness of Voltaire, he attempts to do the same for Diderot. "Le désir d'être neuf, piquant, et cité, de rire, de faire rire, d'être ce qu'on appelait alors 'un écrivain hardi' a plus animé Voltaire que l'irréligion . . . pour Diderot, c'est sa fougue et un grand sujet d'éloquence, ou plutôt de déclamation qui l'a rendu impie" (*Mél.* XXIX, 23).

But Diderot was much more elusive, more difficult to characterize than was the Sage of Ferney. That is why de Ligne is correct only in part when treating of the philosopher, why his incomplete view of Diderot more or less begs the question, leaving us unconvinced, if not dissatisfied. But this change of emphasis in mentioning Diderot's enthusiasm is significant, too. Coming from one who was especially moved by fine words and by sentiments nobly expressed, this reference to "un grand sujet d'éloquence" is curiously favorable. As favorable, in any case, as the positive values attaching to the Prince's commentary on La Harpe's discussion of Seneca. There, we find an attitude whose tolerance seems to disagree with some of those opinions already mentioned, for de Ligne's religious and moral principles become more flexible, rich, and meaningful as he speaks out in favor of Diderot, once the impious materialist, and against La Harpe, the parvenu defender of tradition. "Je crois faire comme La Harpe; je reviens à Sénèque sans qu'on m'en prie; mais c'est pour dire que M. de La Harpe fait un peu trop le gai, l'aimable, et est un peu trop lourd sur le compte de Diderot; il est toujours l'épée dans les reins pour chaque réflexion qu'il se permet sur Sénèque; et dès qu'il en dit du mal (ce qui prouve qu'il est impartial), La Harpe se met à en dire du bien" (*Mél.*, XXVII, 150). Thus did the Prince occasionally give in to the prejudices of his time and discount the fanaticism which enthusiasm was said to generate. In this connection, we cannot forbear quoting a line from his pen which proves our contention, even when taken out of context: "Heureux ceux qui dans tout se contentent de l'exaltation" (*Mél.*, XXXI, 155). We must therefore re-appraise what has been said about de Ligne's ideas on "philosophy" and opine that they were perhaps less important to him than considerations of style.

Now in the eyes of the Prince de Ligne, Diderot was primarily a stylist, and an excellent one, regardless of the vagaries of his thought. "Malgré les défauts et les torts de Diderot, c'eût été peut-être le plus grand prosateur si Rousseau ne l'avait pas éclipsé. Il avait de la verve et un véritable enthousiasme" (*Mél.*, XXVII, 119). The reasons for such a change of opinion are soon apparent when we note that frequently

de Ligne's judgments of Diderot are meted by aesthetic considerations, although, to the end, the Prince would have us believe that "philosophy" was his sole criterion. Need we recall, in this connection, that perhaps the Prince's most famous remark on the philosopher is to be found in his interview with Voltaire, where the Sage proclaims in a tone which is truly more generous than usual for him, that "Diderot, qui pour faire croire qu'il en a [de l'imagination], tombe dans l'enflure et la déclamation" (*Mél.*, X, 177)? Since it is true that the Prince exaggerated his adulation of Voltaire for reasons of personal gain, might not his misunderstanding of Diderot be attributed to a similar motivation? Similar, but not identical. Snobbery is but one manifestation of selfishness, an end in itself, while the enigmatic movement of the Prince's thought concerning Diderot has as yet no name, nor can it be said to have served so well-defined a purpose. As long as de Ligne's religious principles remained dominant, his thought differed so radically from Diderot's as to deter any real understanding. But as soon as those principles were subordinated to other considerations—and, as frequently happened, to questions of style—there developed a more sympathetic interest on his part than many of his contemporaries could appreciate.

One consequence of this last remark may be readily perceived in the conclusion to another reference, where we find an almost conciliatory tone: "C'est dommage qu'il ne soit rien resté de lui qui puisse être de quelque utilité" (*Mél.*, XXVII, 119). Despite the questionableness of de Ligne's utilitarian standard, this lightning glance at the reality behind appearances does seem remarkable at a time when *Jacques le fataliste* and the *Neveu* were still waiting to be published. Yet was it merely his particular interest in Diderot as a stylist which led the Prince to such a conclusion? How are we to interpret the information that in places which fairly beg for a reference to Diderot in de Ligne's commentary on La Harpe, there is none, whether it be a question of Greuze (XXVII, 44), "modern" philosophy (XXVII, 182), or eighteenth-century theater and spectacles (XXVII, 234-74)? But more than this, how are we to reconcile our appreciation with the following judgment? "Diderot, qui va occuper bien ennuyeusement encore 314 pages, ne mérite pas d'être si maltraité pour ses charmants *Bijoux indiscrets*" (*Mél.*, XXIX, 28). Mention of Diderot's style, of Diderot as a stylist, and of the *Bijoux indiscrets* in the same context does seem rather contradictory. Moreover, such contradictions not only seem to have been inspired with a view to confusing the reader, they also seem to have been somewhat less than accidental.

In an article entitled "Le Prince de Ligne, imitateur de Diderot" (*Marche romane*, V, 121-29), Professor Roland Mortier has astutely surmised that the real reason behind the Prince's vacillating attitude might

still lie unsuspected in his voluminous *Mélanges*. The truth of the matter is that de Ligne did willfully attempt to throw dust in the eyes of future critics when discussing Diderot, in order to hide his debt to the philosopher and his works. As revealed by Professor Mortier, the key to our discussion is that not only was the Prince an attentive reader of Diderot, but also, on occasion, an assiduous imitator of the great man. Thus, his remark about the *Bijoux indiscrets* leads to the discovery that de Ligne wrote his own version of this questionable achievement in an otherwise banal exercise entitled *Le Sultan du Congo, ou Mangogul* (*Mél.*, XVIII, 245-92). Yet at the same time, there are other surprises in store for the attentive reader who might wish to go beyond Professor Mortier's article. Despite the tendency of many an eighteenth-century contemporary to make free with the works and efforts of others, the term for the activities of the Prince de Ligne is more properly "imitation" or "adaptation," since even a brief examination of the Prince's works convinces us that there is much to be found there deriving from Diderot. For instance, many of the apophthegms so minutely collected by Paul Champagne for his excellent article on de Ligne, the moralist (in *Actes et travaux* [Bruxelles, 1936], I, 288-305), although properly the stock in trade of many an author, can be traced directly to the work of the philosopher. The same might be said of the Prince's multitudinous *Ecarts posthumes*, especially that section where he treats of the fair sex in the following (Diderotian) manner:

J'ai dit assez bien du goût, de la grâce, de l'esprit délicat, de la finesse, et du style des femmes pour les analyser en petit mal comme en grand bien! Qu'on parle maladie ou affaires, qu'on fasse un projet ou un bâtiment, elles vous donnent tout de suite un conseil. Elles vous désapprouvent. Elles trouvent le mal où il n'est pas. Elles querellent leurs femmes de chambre, mais elles les croient plutôt qu'un homme d'esprit. Elles n'ont pas les mêmes yeux et les mêmes oreilles. Elles tiennent des deux enfances de l'homme. . . . Elles fourmillent de talents. Quelques-unes en ont de distingués en peinture et en musique. Aucune n'a fait un grand opéra et n'a été un Corrège, un Raphaël, etc., pas une tragédie des dames, car on ne peut pas compter la *Genséric* de Deshoulières. *Delphine*, malgré ses nombreux défauts, est l'ouvrage le plus fort qu'une d'entre elles ait produit après le Newtonianisme de Madame du Châtelet et les deux poèmes de Madame du Boccage. Oh! des romans et des lettres tant et plus. . . . Pour la mémoire, j'ai dit ailleurs pourquoi elles n'en avaient pas. Il y en a eu qui ont été élevées comme des hommes. Aucune de celles-là n'a pourtant rien laissé qui les rende célèbres. C'est au dépens de la force qu'elles ont plus de douceur apparente et d'amabilité que nous; mais leurs organes sont manqués. . . . Comptez les bien bonnes femmes, sans contradiction, sans envie, etc. (pp. 21-22)

The style is obviously the Prince's own. But not the attitude nor the material with which he works. Curiously, neither Mademoiselle Oulié

(in *Actes et travaux*, I, 121-28) nor Henri Lebasteur (*Ann. P. de Ligne*, I, 37-68) seems to have noted the similarities between the borrowings of de Ligne in this instance, and, especially, the Prince's debt to Diderot's early opusculé "Sur les femmes" (in *Œuvres*, ed. Assézat, II, 251-62). But until more specific studies of the Prince are available, none can say exactly how far-reaching were these borrowings—imitations or adaptations. And if, as here, they help explain the Prince's varying attitudes toward Diderot, whether, at worst, a façade, or, at best, a manner of pleading in his own behalf, in how many other instances might they not reveal a more than curious figure, a more than "typical" temperament of the eighteenth century, rather, an individual, a personality who is deserving of more serious attention than heretofore? As Professor Mortier has so aptly stated in the conclusion to his article:

Certes le grand art est rare [chez de Ligne], comme la philosophie vraiment profonde, mais que de remarques suggestives et finement formulées, que de sagaces réflexions sur la vie et les hommes! L'historien littéraire est particulièrement bien servi: les morceaux de circonstance, les pièces en vers, constituent souvent des documents de valeur pour la petite histoire ou pour l'étude du goût. . . . Les notes sur le *Lycée* de La Harpe contiennent, outre de singuliers jugements littéraires, une foule de renseignements sur . . . la littérature du XVIII^e siècle. (p. 122)

—*Et sur l'auteur lui-même*, we might add. For "écrivain libre" (to borrow a term from M. Hellens), the Prince de Ligne would seem to have enjoyed, and indeed to have preferred, being able to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds. For how else are we to explain, on the one hand, the paucity of references to Diderot in the works of the Prince, and on the other, the generally unfavorable tone; how else explain the Prince's misplaced attacks on the philosopher's religious ideas and his incongruous appreciation of Diderot as a stylist, unless it were to screen his own activity as an intermediary—and a valuable one for our knowledge of the Enlightenment in France and abroad? For although the Prince de Ligne may have had few personal contacts with Diderot the man, he knew Diderot's works well and was stimulated or, on occasion, challenged by them, so that, if only by reaction, he became more deeply indebted to Diderot than we realize. There are undoubtedly further proofs of what we have advanced in the Prince's voluminous works and correspondence; but until those works and their ideas are better known, none can say for sure.

DEUX NOUVEAUX PORTRAITS DE JEAN-JACQUES

Par Georges May

YALE UNIVERSITY

QUE DE LIVRES SUR Rousseau en ces années commémoratives, où le second centenaire du *Contrat social* et d'*Émile* fait suite à celui de la *Nouvelle Héloïse*, avant de céder le pas à ceux de la *Lettre à Christophe de Beaumont*, des *Lettres de la montagne*! Trop de livres, dirait un fidèle rousseauiste, en souvenir de celui que s'écrie au milieu du troisième livre d'*Émile*: "Je hais les livres; ils n'apprennent qu'à parler de ce qu'on ne sait pas."

Et pourtant, malgré leur nature de livres, les deux ouvrages que Ronald Grimsley et François Jost ont fait paraître en 1961 auraient bien des raisons de plaire à celui dont le nom apparaît dans leurs titres et dont on devait célébrer en 1962 le 250^e anniversaire. D'abord ce fait que c'est lui, l'homme Jean-Jacques, qu'ils prennent pour sujet, et non ses ouvrages, ni même ses idées, se conformant en cela à la maxime que Rousseau prescrit à la marquise de Verdelin dans une lettre de 1760 que cite M. Jost: "... il faut expliquer les discours d'un homme par son caractère et non son caractère par ses discours." (II, 12.) Ensuite cet autre fait non moins important qu'ils choisissent l'un et l'autre pour cadre de référence ou pour angle d'approche un élément de son univers intérieur reconnu explicitement par Rousseau comme essentiel: *self-awareness*, soit connaissance et conscience de soi dans le cas de M. Grimsley; la Suisse dans le cas de M. Jost. Enfin, et ce n'est peut-être pas le moins important, les deux auteurs apparaissent qualifiés pour la tâche qu'ils se sont assignée, non seulement par les preuves qu'ils ont données dans leurs travaux antérieurs, mais parce qu'ils remplissent aussi les conditions expresses qu'eût prescrites Rousseau: ils ont pris la peine de le connaître, et ils sont en sympathie avec lui. Décidément le 250^e anniversaire de Rousseau se sera distingué du 200^e par le fait que ceux qui l'auront célébré par leurs livres n'en auront pas pris prétexte pour monter contre lui un réquisitoire. Car c'est bien à quoi collaborèrent, il y a une cinquantaine d'années, Jules Lemaitre, Émile Faguet, Irving Babbitt, le baron Seillière et quelques autres des artisans d'une conspiration bien plus efficace encore que celle dont Rousseau s'était tant plaint de son vivant. Ce demi-siècle n'aura donc pas été inutile: on pourrait presque en conclure que Rousseau avait tort de ne pas croire au progrès.

L'intention du nouveau livre de M. Ronald Grimsley¹ est d'étudier le développement de la personnalité de Rousseau, de présenter une sorte de biographie intérieure expliquée et commentée de l'homme qui avait déjà essayé de faire ce travail pour lui-même. S'il s'agit donc surtout de suivre l'histoire des rapports de Rousseau avec lui-même, c'est parce que, selon M. Grimsley, la mise au point de ces rapports a constitué la grande affaire de la vie de Rousseau: "... the main problem of his life was not to discover a new attitude towards the world, nature or even God, but to solve the difficult problem of personal relations" (p. 252). C'est pourquoi l'objectif de ce livre n'est ni littéraire, ni idéologique, mais psychologique, au sens dynamique de ce mot; et c'est aussi pourquoi les résultats de cette enquête psychologique éclairent notre connaissance des idées de Rousseau et de son système de valeurs.

Le propos de cet ouvrage est donc bien dans la lignée des principales études rousseauistes des dernières années, notamment de celles de MM. Guéhenno, Burgelin et Starobinski, que M. Grimsley cite plus d'une fois. Son ambition, toutefois, est, sinon plus modeste et plus limitée, tout au moins plus circonscrite que celle de ses prédécesseurs: cherchant surtout, comme on l'a vu, à retrouver les motifs psychologiques de la grande aventure spirituelle de Rousseau, il leur subordonne, sans les ignorer, les considérations morales, religieuses, métaphysiques, et, en général, idéologiques. La notion de *transparence*, si magistralement analysée dans l'ouvrage de M. Starobinski qui a pour sous-titre *La transparence et l'obstacle* (1957), est également centrale à la recherche de M. Grimsley. Sur divers points les deux ouvrages se recoupent donc: "... in spite of its much later publication, my own book was virtually complete before I was able to read M. Starobinski's. However, I take the opportunity of a final revision to indicate a number of points of contact between the two interpretations and to benefit from his perspicacious observations" (p. 32, n. 2). Par ailleurs le point de vue fréquemment existentiel de cette étude l'apparente aussi à la thèse de M. Burgelin: *La philosophie de l'existence de J.-J. Rousseau* (1952). Du reste, M. Grimsley s'était déjà signalé par son ouvrage *Existential Thought* (1955) comme un interprète autorisé de la pensée et des méthodes d'analyse existentialistes.

Mais ce qui distingue surtout cette étude de celles qui l'ont précédée, et ce qui fait aussi son singulier mérite, c'est que son auteur résiste victorieusement à la tentation de tout embrasser et de tout expliquer grâce à l'angle d'approche qu'il a choisi, et qu'il ne pense pas non plus que Rousseau ait mené à bien le grand projet dont il lui reconnaît l'intention. M. Grimsley étudie attentivement la personnalité de Rousseau

1. Ronald Grimsley, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: A Study in Self-Awareness* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961), pp. 338.

sans chercher à l'unifier à tout prix, sinon par la tendance permanente mais jamais totalement réalisée de se mieux connaître elle-même. En fait la conclusion à laquelle il aboutit, et selon laquelle Rousseau aurait finalement échoué, est peut-être l'aspect le plus discutable de ce livre: la sérénité du Rousseau des dernières années est-elle, en effet, le résultat de sa résignation à l'échec, ou le signe de sa réussite?

Cette *Study in Self-Awareness* témoigne d'une longue familiarité avec les textes de Rousseau, comme aussi de beaucoup de soin, de patience et de perspicacité à interroger ces textes. Grâce à cela, grâce également à la maîtrise qu'il a de la bibliographie rousseauiste, et à son adresse à appliquer les méthodes psychologiques modernes, M. Grimsley réussit à dominer un sujet complexe et difficile, et à entrer sans réserve dans les motifs souvent obscurs des démarches de Rousseau, sans jamais abandonner pour cela l'attitude objective et l'esprit ouvert du clinicien. Cet équilibre peu commun est peut-être un des aspects les plus remarquables de cette étude. Plusieurs des travaux antérieurs de M. Grimsley, sur Diderot comme sur Rousseau, avaient déjà témoigné de cette rare combinaison de qualités: sympathie éclairée et sens critique avisé, l'ensemble abrité de toute passion.

Là n'est pas le seul mérite de ce livre: un autre tient au fait que la méthode que suit M. Grimsley consiste largement en un examen empirique des textes, et non pas à s'appuyer simplement sur des citations bien choisies pour échafauder une construction philosophique personnelle. Les textes ainsi examinés sont nombreux et divers. M. Grimsley ne se borne pas, comme il le dit dans la première phrase de son introduction, à étudier "the correspondence and personal writings" (p. 1), sauf si l'expression *écrits personnels* est interprétée assez libéralement pour recouvrir la majeure partie de l'œuvre de Rousseau. C'est ainsi, par exemple, que le quatrième chapitre a pour titre *la Nouvelle Héloïse*, et montre bien dans quelle perspective le roman de Rousseau est un document clef sur l'art-de-vivre de l'auteur à une époque immédiatement antérieure à celle des *Lettres à Malesherbes*. Or ces *Lettres* sont d'un intérêt capital du point de vue de M. Grimsley: "In the *Quatre lettres à M. de Malesherbes* . . . we find Rousseau's first systematic attempt to see his character as a whole and to give his self-consciousness a stable and coherent form by eliminating or explaining the contradictions of his character in the light of its more fundamental attributes" (p. 186). L'analyse du roman de Rousseau par M. Grimsley confirme l'observation que fait M. Guyon, le dernier éditeur de *la Nouvelle Héloïse*, dans l'introduction de son édition: les commentateurs récents de Rousseau tendent tous à accorder une place de plus en plus importante à ce roman dans toute tentative de compréhension de son auteur.

De même donc que *la Nouvelle Héloïse* est un texte plus important

que l'*Émile* du point de vue de cette étude, de même la correspondance est plus importante que le *Contrat social* et que les autres écrits sociaux et politiques; de même encore les *Lettres morales à Sophie* et les *Lettres à Malesherbes* sont plus intéressantes que la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, et les *Dialogues* et *Réveries* plus révélateurs que les *Confessions*.

Le septième chapitre, "*Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques*," est, sans doute, avec les travaux de M. Osmont, ce qui a été écrit de meilleur sur le plus déconcertant des grands écrits de Rousseau. M. Grimsley y analyse avec beaucoup de sagacité et de bon sens ce qu'on appelle parfois la paranoïa de Rousseau, et en cherche les causes dans l'évolution des rapports de Rousseau avec lui-même, telle que les chapitres précédents l'ont retracée. Il y avance la théorie intéressante selon laquelle cette paranoïa est rendue en quelque sorte nécessaire à Rousseau par le besoin de trouver à tout prix un remède capable de le soulager du sentiment intolérable de culpabilité qui a résisté jusque-là à toute tentative de refoulement. Comme M. Grimsley le dit clairement dans son chapitre de conclusion:

. . . Jean-Jacques needed to believe in the reality of his "persecutors" since their presence provided him with an outlet for feelings he could not openly face: as a means of alleviating the intolerable anxiety associated with feelings of guilt and unworthiness, this image served to conceal from him the truth about his own state of mind: as long as he was aware of the hostility of his "persecutors," he could believe that he was being attacked *because of his innocence*. Persecution thus acted as a kind of objective guarantee of Jean-Jacques's "goodness." (p. 314)

Comme on en jugera peut-être par ces quelques citations, M. Grimsley a l'art de manipuler les abstractions dans un style dépouillé, détaché, élégant, soucieux d'éviter le jargon psychologique ou philosophique, ce qui lui assure le maximum de clarté possible. Non que son livre se laisse toujours lire facilement. Son sujet ne le permettait pas, à moins d'un traitement uniquement superficiel. Et comme, de plus, M. Grimsley a beaucoup à dire sur ce sujet, il suppose bien des choses connues de son lecteur. Mais l'effort que doit donc faire celui-ci est facilité par la netteté et la sécheresse avec laquelle M. Grimsley écrit, de même qu'il trouve sa récompense dans la richesse et la densité des analyses qui lui sont offertes.

Son livre est sans conteste le meilleur en anglais et l'un des meilleurs en général sur la vie intérieure de Rousseau, et sur l'angoissante aventure spirituelle qui constitue l'histoire de cette vie. L'éditeur n'a pas tort d'écrire à l'intérieur du couvre-livre imprimé: "As well as being intended as a contribution to Rousseau studies, this book is addressed to all readers who are interested in the problems of human personality."

C'est une toute autre face de ce qu'on pourrait encore appeler la personnalité de Rousseau dont M. Jost a en partie l'intention de retracer le portrait. Le but de son monumental ouvrage,² indiqué dans le titre et précisé dans l'introduction, n'est pas simplement d'établir l'appartenance genevoise de Rousseau: M. Jost reconnaît sur ce point la valeur des travaux de ses prédécesseurs, en particulier Gaspard Vallette au livre célèbre de qui, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau Genevois* (1911), il rend expressément l'hommage qui lui revient (I, 4, n. 2). L'intention qui sert de base et de guide à la vaste entreprise de M. Jost est de trouver les réponses aux questions suivantes: "Dans quelle mesure Rousseau, Genevois, est-il Suisse? Dans quelle mesure son caractère de Genevois et de Suisse a-t-il influencé son œuvre? Enfin, dans quelle mesure le message de Rousseau est-il un message suisse?" (I, 5).

Autant de questions qui exigent une double série de démonstrations: tendant, d'une part, à établir l'existence, à l'époque de Rousseau, d'une nationalité, d'un patriotisme, d'un caractère, d'une culture suisses; et, de l'autre, à montrer l'adhésion de Rousseau à ces entités. D'où la structure même de l'ouvrage. Un premier volume, consacré aux "Attaches suisses de Rousseau," examine successivement "Les données de l'histoire" helvétique, puis "L'attitude de Rousseau" à l'égard tant des pays romands, que de la Suisse alémanique. Quant au second tome, qui présente les "Orientations suisses de Rousseau," il étudie tour à tour les "Attirances et affinités" de Rousseau par rapport à la Suisse, et ses "Antagonismes et antinomies" par rapport à la France. Ce plan solide permet un exposé d'une limpidité exemplaire, dont la rançon inévitable est le danger de répétitions, qui n'est pas toujours évité. C'est ainsi, par exemple, que le commentaire de la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, le plus ouvertement et le plus profondément genevois des livres de Rousseau, apparaît à la fois dans le premier volume (pp. 243-59) et dans le second (pp. 263-70). On aurait tort, du reste, de voir là une faiblesse sérieuse de l'ouvrage: l'ambition même qui est la sienne nécessite ces prises de contact successives et répétées, faute desquelles la complexité de l'ensemble obscurcirait la clarté admirable dont M. Jost ne se départ jamais.

Et pourtant, malgré la netteté de sa méthode, M. Jost ne peut éviter de parcourir un chemin semé d'embûches. Historien informé, scrupuleux, objectif, clair et modeste—se conformant assez bien au total avec le caractère suisse, tel qu'il le conçoit et le définit lui-même—celui-ci ne manque pas de reconnaître les périls auxquels le voue son entreprise. Il le fait parfois implicitement, comme, par exemple, dans les premières lignes de son chapitre sur "Le patriote suisse":

2. François Jost, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau Suisse: Étude sur sa personnalité et sa pensée*. 2 vols. (Fribourg en Suisse: Éditions Universitaires, 1961), pp. x + 445 + 458.

Devant la loi, Jean-Jacques est Genevois et Neuchâtelois. Or, la République de Genève et la Principauté de Neuchâtel, devant l'histoire et selon le droit des gens, sont membres du Corps helvétique. Cependant, objectera-t-on, il s'en est fallu que le patriotisme suisse de Rousseau fût aussi vif que son patriotisme genevois: chez Jean-Jacques le patriotisme local passe de beaucoup le patriotisme confédéral.

La thèse d'un Rousseau suisse s'en trouve-t-elle ébranlée pour autant? Bien au contraire. Car il s'agit là d'un phénomène commun à tous les Confédérés. A l'instar du citoyen de Genève, celui de Berne, de Lucerne, de Fribourg, avant d'être Suisse, était Bernois, Lucernois, Fribourgeois. (I, 190-91)

Le contenu du chapitre qui suit ces remarques ne parvient, en effet, pas tout à fait à dissiper l'impression qu'en ce qui concerne Rousseau, homme et penseur, le patriotisme suisse hypothétique n'ajoute pas grand'chose à ce que nous savions des sentiments du Citoyen de Genève. Il en va de même des sentiments ambigus dont il témoigne envers la France, et sur lesquels il nous faudra revenir plus loin. Le fait que ces sentiments aient existé, comme M. Jost le montre bien, chez d'autres Suisses de son époque, notamment chez ceux de langue française, suffit-il, en effet, à démontrer que Rousseau, en les éprouvant, se soit montré suisse plutôt que genevois?

C'est pourquoi l'originalité et le mérite de cet ouvrage résident sans doute moins dans la démonstration de l'équation qui lui sert de titre et de thèse, que dans la lumière qu'il jette sur chacun de ses deux termes, à savoir Rousseau, d'une part, et la Suisse, de l'autre, deux sujets que M. Jost connaît admirablement.

Aux rousseauistes d'aujourd'hui, qui ne sont pas suisses d'origine et qui connaissent souvent fort peu et fort mal l'histoire, la culture, la pensée et la littérature helvétiques, le livre de M. Jost rendra les plus grands services. Il sera une source de renseignements et de jugements infiniment précieux, comme le savent à l'avance ceux d'entre eux qui connaissent ses ouvrages antérieurs, en particulier sa remarquable étude de 1956 sur *La Suisse dans les lettres françaises au cours des âges*.

Les chapitres du présent ouvrage sur "Rousseau et la Suisse allemande" (I, 331-445), et sur "La critique suisse au XVIII^e siècle" (II, 232-53) nous ont paru à bien des égards les plus remarquables, comme aussi les plus originaux. Les pages consacrées aux idées et aux accents déjà si rousseauistes du poème *Die Alpen* d'Albert de Haller (I, 387-97); comme celles de l'Appendice V (II, 337-83) présentant pour la première fois les notes de lecture de Rousseau en marge des *Lettres sur les Anglais et les Français* et sur les voyages de Béat de Muralt, sont particulièrement neuves et suggestives. Elles sont même de ce point de vue exceptionnelles dans un ouvrage qui, par sa nature et en dehors de sa thèse générale, est plus riche de faits que d'idées nouvelles.

Car la méthode de M. Jost exige aussi l'élaboration d'une sorte de synthèse de nos connaissances sur Rousseau. Or la bibliographie rousseauiste étant une des plus vastes qui soient, et le rythme auquel de nouvelles contributions viennent s'y ajouter ne semblant, comme on le voit, aucunement se ralentir, il ne pouvait évidemment être question d'une synthèse complète. C'est pourquoi le biais suisse pourra paraître convenir exceptionnellement bien à un effort aussi considérable de mise au point systématique de nos connaissances. On admirera la maîtrise avec laquelle M. Jost domine cette gigantesque masse de livres et d'articles. Elle apparaît non seulement dans les 25 pages de bibliographie (II, 387-411) où l'auteur énumère quelque 500 ouvrages critiques, mais aussi dans la richesse, l'à-propos et la précision des nombreuses notes et renvois au bas des pages. La bibliographie comme les notes rendront d'incalculables services aux chercheurs qui voudront, à leur tour, étudier et développer tel ou tel aspect de cette magistrale étude.

On pourra peut-être reprocher à celle-ci quelques longueurs. Toutes les citations qui l'illustrent ne sont pas également nécessaires ni convaincantes. Certaines, plus faibles que d'autres ou redondantes, auraient pu être remplacées par de simples renvois en note, sans compromettre pour cela la clarté de l'exposé, et sans nuire, au contraire, à la force des arguments. Certains développements—sans rien perdre de leur intérêt—pourront sembler tourner parfois à la digression. Le chapitre sur "Rousseau et les femmes" (II, 112-33), par exemple, semble s'éloigner progressivement du sujet central de ce livre, à tel point que le lecteur éprouvera peut-être quelque stupeur et quelque réticence à lire au bas de la dernière page, au terme d'un assez long développement sur l'attachement déconcertant de Rousseau pour Thérèse Levasseur, l'explication proposée, à savoir que celle-ci

... répond parfaitement à la conception que Rousseau s'était faite de la femme, elle incarne l'image de la femme telle qu'il la rêve non sans doute pour lui, mais pour le genre humain...

Quelle est donc cette conception, quelle est cette image?

La réponse à cette question nous rapproche de notre véritable sujet: Rousseau, quand il débat le problème, défend des idées suisses, suggère et même préconise des solutions suisses. C'est parce que les racines de son être et de sa pensée s'enfoncent bien profondément en terre confédérée. (II, 133)

On pourrait en fait reprocher en général à la méthode de M. Jost d'être moins démonstrative qu'il ne le pense. Dégager dans la pensée de Rousseau une idée dont on peut relever la présence dans la Suisse de son temps ne suffit pas à démontrer l'appartenance suisse de cette idée. Il faudrait encore établir qu'elle n'existe pas dans les autres cultures au contact desquelles Rousseau a vécu. Or c'est là précisément ce qui, sur bien des points ne nous paraît pas faisable. Ceci est particulièrement

évident des deux appendices consacrés au goût de Rousseau pour le vin (II, 315-30) et à son amour des animaux (II, 331-36), deux aspects de sa vie affective dans lesquels on aurait mauvaise grâce à voir une exclusivité helvétique. Mais, même à-propos de plusieurs des développements les plus importants du second volume, on aimerait présenter la même objection: ce qui est vrai de la Suisse, ne l'est-il pas aussi de la France, de l'Italie, voire de l'Allemagne de l'époque? Prenons quelques exemples.

Le goût du journal intime et des écrits autobiographiques, qui témoigne selon M. Jost de la timidité caractéristique du tempérament suisse en général et de celui de Rousseau en particulier, est-il aussi spécifiquement helvétique qu'il le pense? Aux noms des Suisses qu'il allègue (Amiel, Sismondi, Meister, Constant...), on aimerait opposer et ajouter ceux de bien des Français et de bien des Italiens qui ne furent pas tous des timides: songeons à des caractères aussi divers que ceux de Cardan et de Cellini, de Montaigne et de Palissy, de Goldoni et de Casanova. Mais la timidité même de Rousseau, à laquelle M. Jost consacre un beau et épais chapitre (II, 65-111), ne le rapproche-t-elle pas—autant que d'Amiel, de Keller ou de Meyer—d'un Parisien de vieille souche comme Boileau, dont le caractère ressemble si fort sur tant de points à celui de Rousseau, que l'Alceste de Molière, gentilhomme bien français qui s'en inspire un peu, est, de l'aveu même de M. Jost, "le portrait fidèle, quoique incomplet, du futur Jean-Jacques" (II, 98)?

Nous en dirions autant sur plusieurs points des deux longs chapitres consacrés aux femmes. La situation juridique des Françaises du temps de Rousseau était-elle si différente de celle des Suissesses? Au reste, les choses devaient changer bien lentement, puisque, si les Suissesses d'aujourd'hui n'ont pas encore le droit de vote, les Françaises, elles, durent attendre 1945 pour recevoir ce droit. Sans doute les mœurs sociales, surtout dans le monde parisien, étaient-elles plus féministes en France qu'en Suisse au temps de Rousseau, mais cela ne levait en rien la tutelle légale contre laquelle s'insurgeaient des Parisiennes de l'époque comme la marquise de Lambert ou madame d'Épinay. De vieilles traditions anti-féministes subsistaient en profondeur dans la France où vécut Rousseau, même si, à la surface, un vernis féministe miroitait avec assez de brillant pour faire illusion. A cet égard, en fait, on peut remarquer un accord assez rare entre Rousseau et Voltaire.

Enfin le cosmopolitisme et le moralisme qui, selon le chapitre de M. Jost "Doctrines littéraires et théories esthétiques," constituaient les deux grandes lignes de force de la pensée suisse du XVIII^e siècle, étaient si peu une exclusivité helvétique que, dans sa conclusion, l'auteur reconnaît volontiers: "ici se rejoignent, avec quelques autres, Montesquieu et Rousseau" (II, 231).

De la même manière encore, dans un chapitre antérieur, évoquant les traits qui rapprochent les écrits de Rousseau des caractères généraux de la littérature de son pays—gravité, chasteté, sérieux—M. Jost observe judicieusement que le style de Rousseau, lui, échappe à ce déterminisme suisse: "De toute évidence, il faut ici mettre Rousseau à part" (II, 75). La raison de cette anomalie, Rousseau la connaissait fort bien: elle tenait selon lui—et il voyait juste—au fait que son goût s'était formé sous l'influence, non de Genève, ni même de Chambéry, mais de Paris. Ce qu'il fait écrire du goût français à Julie comme à Claire (cf. *Nouvelle Héloïse*, II, xviii; VI, v) en témoigne autant que ce qu'il écrit lui-même en 1755 à son ami le pasteur Vernes: "Genève est le pays de la sagesse et de la raison, et Paris le siège du goût" (cité II, 196, n. 2).

Or c'est justement cette part de la France, que Rousseau reconnut personnellement, même si ce fut souvent pour la regretter, que le livre de M. Jost nous paraît sous-estimer trop systématiquement. Non que ce livre s'abstienne de présenter l'attitude révélatrice de Rousseau vis-à-vis de plusieurs écrivains français. Au contraire, son excellent chapitre sur "La critique littéraire de Rousseau" (II, 254-94) contient des pages fort pertinentes sur les affinités de Rousseau avec La Bruyère ou Fénelon, sur son aversion pour Bayle, pages suggestives et judicieuses, capables sans doute de susciter des études plus poussées de ces goûts littéraires particuliers de Rousseau. Mais ce qui nous semble surtout manquer c'est l'examen systématique de l'autre pôle d'attraction, sans lequel le phénomène Rousseau nous paraît inexplicable.

Certes c'est là le sujet d'un autre livre et ce n'était pas l'objet de celui de M. Jost. On peut cependant regretter qu'un ouvrage intitulé *Jean-Jacques Rousseau Suisse* ne s'attache pas au moins à résoudre un problème pourtant central que pose la biographie de Rousseau: pourquoi, lorsqu'il fit en 1754 le voyage de Genève, pour rentrer dans la religion de ses pères et reprendre son titre de Citoyen de Genève, renonça-t-il à élire résidence sur le territoire de la République? Les lignes que M. Jost consacre à cette question nous paraissent en méconnaître l'importance: "... l'heure du veau gras ne viendra point pour cet enfant prodigue. Les soucis se multiplient: les grossesses illicites de Thérèse, dont au surplus, il doit supporter les sautes d'humeur, maladies et infirmités des vieux Levasseur, dont il croit avoir la charge, bref, maintes misères l'empêchent de réaliser son plan." (I, 165) En effet, pourquoi l'heure du veau gras ne sonnera-t-elle jamais pour Rousseau? Pourquoi se jugera-t-il exilé lorsqu'il devra quitter la France en 1762? Pourquoi y reviendra-t-il incognito cinq ans plus tard? Pourquoi rentrera-t-il à Paris en 1770, quitte à y résider dans une semi-clandestinité? Autant de questions importantes que pose la biographie de Rousseau et auxquelles il ne semble

pas possible de chercher une réponse dans le seul cadre d'un *Jean-Jacques Rousseau Suisse*.

C'est pourquoi, ce que ce livre nous semble surtout établir c'est que, si Rousseau n'avait pas subi l'attraction de la France et de Paris, il aurait été un autre Abauzit, un autre Haller, ou un autre Muralt. Car, même si la part de la Suisse est peut-être la plus importante, il n'en reste pas moins que la part de la France est essentielle aussi, qu'on ne peut guère en faire abstraction, même pour les besoins de l'analyse, et que ce n'est peut-être qu'un sophisme d'en dire: "Si Jean-Jacques n'avait pas aimé la France, un élément essentiel eût manqué à son caractère national suisse" (II, 179).

De plus, ce qui est vrai sur le plan de la formation culturelle l'est peut-être aussi jusqu'à un certain point sur celui du sentiment national. A cet égard, nous nous rangerions plutôt à l'avis d'Alexandre Choulguine, lequel, dans sa remarquable étude sur "Les origines de l'esprit national moderne" (*Annales J.-J. Rousseau*, 1937), analyse chez le Citoyen de Genève une tension marquée entre le patriotisme genevois et l'amour de la France, plutôt qu'une absorption de l'un dans l'autre. C'est pourquoi nous ne sommes pas du même avis que M. Jost lorsque, après avoir mentionné l'étude d'Alexandre Choulguine, il affirme: "En réalité, le penchant de Jean-Jacques pour le pays dont il tenait, comme ses compatriotes, le meilleur de sa formation intellectuelle, ne se trouvait nullement en contradiction avec son patriotisme genevois que nous savons très ardent" (II, 293).

En fait la raison fondamentale de notre désaccord, loin de tenir à un simple parti pris d'un chauvinisme mesquin—rien n'en est plus éloigné que le point de vue élevé et objectif de M. Jost—tient au fait que cette thèse nous semble systématiser un peu trop un homme qui, moins que tout autre peut-être, se prête à pareille simplification. Si Rousseau résiste, en effet, à cette tentative, c'est à cause autant de la structure de sa personnalité que de son hostilité de principe à tout système, hostilité que M. Jost ne se fait faute d'ailleurs de relever: "Encore un trait suisse de Rousseau: son aversion contre les systèmes, les principes, les maximes, les généralités, les abstractions..." (II, 229, n. 2).

Quoique la méthode de M. Jost soit plus souple et moins étroitement tainienne qu'on ne pourrait en juger d'après la table des matières de son ouvrage, elle tient de la critique positiviste le souci de découvrir, sinon la "faculté maîtresse," du moins le trait principal de l'homme dont elle cherche à restituer le portrait, quitte peut-être à l'accuser en y insistant de façon un peu trop appuyée. L'inconvénient, dans le cas particulier de Rousseau, est que cette méthode, telle que l'applique M. Jost, a pour effet de sous-estimer d'autres conditions déterminantes du caractère de l'auteur des *Confessions*. Nous pensons non seulement

au magnétisme exercé par Paris et la civilisation Louis XV, magnétisme éprouvé et réprouvé par Rousseau, mais aussi aux déterminations physiologiques du valétudinaire que fut Rousseau, notamment aux humiliations et aux souffrances auxquelles l'asservissaient sa maladie et les formes particulières de sa sexualité.

Bref, si nous éprouvons quelque réticence en lisant dans la Prière d'insérer: "... il n'est si grand talent qui ne soit issu d'une race, d'un milieu, qui n'ait reçu l'empreinte d'une communauté linguistique et nationale, économique et religieuse," parce que nous craignons que l'article *un* n'y ait le sens numérique du latin *unus*; en revanche, nous souscrivons à ce qu'on y lit plus loin:

Certes, la personnalité de Rousseau apparaît trop complexe pour se couler, sans perdre l'essentiel de son caractère singulier, dans le moule de quelque catégorie nationale. Aussi l'auteur de cet ouvrage ne prétend-il pas avoir dit le dernier mot sur ce formidable remueur d'idées que fut le citoyen de Genève. Il s'agit bien plutôt d'une tentative d'approcher l'écrivain par la voie qui semble la bonne. On ne le dira jamais assez: un génie ne se laisse point enchâsser dans une étroite gangue explicative, ne se laisse point ramener à quelques formules générales; on le circonscrit, on ne le pénètre pas.

Cela dit, la thèse de l'auteur étant toujours présentée ouvertement et loyalement, son livre rendra les plus grands services aux études rousseauistes. Il est, en effet, une mine de renseignements présentés avec sûreté, clarté et probité. La mine sera longtemps exploitée; et les trente-deux pages de l'index, comme les quatorze pages de la table analytique seront souvent consultées. La qualité matérielle de la présentation ajoutera encore à la commodité et à l'utilité de ces deux beaux volumes, fidèles aux nobles traditions de goût et de distinction de l'industrie du livre, telle que la pratiquent les compatriotes du petit apprenti graveur d'autrefois.³

3. En dehors de quelques petites fautes typographiques vénielles, nous n'avons relevé qu'une coquille authentique—amusante il est vrai. Parlant des écrivains de la Renaissance qui se sont penchés sur les questions pédagogiques (Montaigne, Rabelais, Erasme, etc.), M. Jost observe que, si ceux-ci s'intéressent à l'éducation des garçons, en revanche ils "ne parlent guère qu'indécemment de celle des filles" (II, 137, n. 2). Nous voulons penser que notre collègue avait écrit *incidemment*.

REVIEWS

Esquisse historique de la linguistique française et de ses rapports avec la linguistique générale. Par Louis Kukenheim. Leiden: Universitaire Pers, 1962. Pp. vi + 205. The title of Professor Kukenheim's manual indicates accurately its scope and its limitations. By sketching for advanced students of the French language France's contribution to linguistics, the author organizes information heretofore available mainly in treatises concerned with the broader history of Romance philology. His previous studies, one on the history of Italian, Spanish and French in the Renaissance, another on Greek, Latin and Hebrew in the same period, and his familiarity with the trends of contemporary linguistic thought, enable him to place the great French grammarians in a perspective that differs at times from the traditional approach of such an authority as Ferdinand Brunot. He sees, for example, in Pierre de la Ramée a precursor of the modern structuralists.

Professor Kukenheim divides his study into six sections, one on the prehistory of general linguistics up to 1800, three on the nineteenth and two on the twentieth centuries, all but the first subdivided into: 1) general linguistics, 2) French linguistics, 3) French grammar. He sees the evolution of linguistic thought as proceeding by generations of 30 to 36 years' duration, each one dominated by a concept or technique (*logicisme, comparatisme, historisme, positivisme, parallélisme, structuration*) or by a leading scholar (Raynouard, Diez, Gaston Paris). Artificial and arbitrary, this presentation in practice works out fairly well, and linguistic trends are linked to the history of the times. It is even suggested that cubism helps to explain the rise of structuralism. The tripartite exposition, proceeding from the general to the particular, has led, however, to repetition, which the author tries to obviate by using asterisks after titles or scholars mentioned more than once. The reader finds the page references in the Index. Unfortunately, many pages are cluttered with stars which distract the reader unnecessarily.

At his best in his exposition of the earlier periods, Professor Kukenheim has succeeded in highlighting the contribution of French scholars to philology and linguistic theory, and in justifying his comment (p. 73): "Si la linguistique française fait l'impression d'être à ses débuts, une science allemande, il convient de noter, d'autre part, que Grimm, Schlegel, Bopp, [et] Diez ont commencé leurs études à Paris et, s'il est vrai que le jeune Gaston Paris est allé se perfectionner chez Diez à Bonn, il faut remarquer aussi que la France peut s'enorgueillir de noms d'illustres philologues. . . ." He does not, however, provide as thorough an introduction to contemporary linguistics, although we find references occasionally to the Prague School, the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen, the Bloomfield adherents in America, etc. He provides the student with a good *état présent* of current work in special fields, such as phonemics, semantics, dialectology, stylistics, etc., but the survey is not exhaustive. Thus in the field of experimental phonetics, he overlooks Jeanne Varney Pleasants' *Etudes sur l'E muet—Timbre, Durée, Intensité, Hauteur musicale* (Paris, 1956),

and there is no mention of the important contributions of Pierre Delattre and the Haskins Laboratories of New York. The Appendices list linguistics journals and some bibliographical aids. In his concluding chapter, he stresses the advantages of modern technology in language analysis, the progress that has been made in mechanical translation, and notes with satisfaction that Professor B. Quemada's "Centre d'étude du vocabulaire français" at Besançon, by preparing a complete "trésor" of the French language, again puts France in the lead. "Toujours soucieuse de sa haute civilisation et consciente des valeurs spirituelles et historiques, la France a donné aux autres nations un lumineux exemple en utilisant la technique en vue d'un idéal." (LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM, *Columbia University*)

Essai de bibliographie critique de stylistique française et romane (1955-1960). Par Helmut Hatzfeld et Yves Le Hir. (Université de Grenoble, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines, 26.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1961. Pp. 313. C'est en 1953 que H. Hatzfeld publia en anglais la première édition de cette bibliographie; elle fit événement: les études de stylistique littéraire en recevaient comme une consécration; leur statut de discipline indépendante était reconnu. La version espagnole, en 1955, contenait de nombreuses additions, qui démontraient la vitalité de la nouvelle science (voir mes comptes-rendus, *RR*, XLVI [1955], 49-52; XLVIII [1957], 315-16). La présente édition, préparée en français par Y. Le Hir, témoigne de l'essor toujours plus rapide de la stylistique (1,793 publications de 1955 à 1960, contre 2,045 de 1900 à 1955). C'est un signe des temps: de plus en plus l'impressionnisme paraît une impasse; on se lasse de tourner autour d'une œuvre sans y pénétrer; on sent mieux qu'on doit chercher à étudier le poème dans son essence, qui est verbale, formelle, linguistique en un mot. Il y a plus: à parcourir les résumés de M. Le Hir, il apparaît que les deux grands courants de la stylistique sont sur le point de converger, ce qui devrait amener une véritable révolution dans l'étude de la littérature française et, plus généralement, des littératures romanes.

Il y a encore en effet deux familles distinctes de stylisticiens: les héritiers de la rhétorique et de la critique historique, et, d'autre part, les linguistes. Le premier groupe domine presque exclusivement le monde occidental (à l'exception des Etats-Unis): à peu près tous les romanistes en font partie; et un coup d'œil à la bibliographie montre que la plupart des contributions présentent les tendances caractéristiques de la tradition européenne: on s'y contente, dans l'ensemble, de pratiquer sans essayer de repenser les buts et les principes propres à la stylistique. C'est pourtant la question de la pertinence qui est la plus importante dans une discipline comme la nôtre, dont la première tâche est de se différencier d'un côté de la grammaire et, de l'autre, de l'esthétique. Ceci dit, il s'en faut que le pragmatisme dont on se contente soit satisfaisant: la majorité des romanistes pratique encore l'explication de textes traditionnelle, trop souvent mixture de subjectivité et d'apriorisme "normatif," trop souvent exercice de virtuosité. A un niveau plus élevé, l'analyse s'appuie bien sur des données objectives: l'étude des variantes, la statistique (encore que l'emploi de celle-ci ait grand besoin d'être réexaminé: M. Le Hir voudrait

des statistiques plus complètes, pour confirmer, par exemple, l'analyse que G. Antoine donne des odes de Claudel; je crois qu'il est plus urgent de se demander dans quelle mesure des résultats statistiques peuvent être pertinents à l'étude de la perception des effets de style; cf. *Word*, XII [1956], 324-27, et B. Mandelbrot, *Word*, XIII [1957], 159-60). Mais dès qu'il s'agit d'interpréter ces données, le problème de l'impressionnisme se pose à nouveau: on ne semble pas avoir étudié de près le passage du constat d'existence des faits au jugement de valeur. Enfin l'analyse tend encore, sous prétexte de transcender l'œuvre, à s'orienter vers l'auteur: on remplace l'examen du poème par un historique de sa genèse; on cherche au-delà du poème une intention à laquelle il n'y a pourtant pas de raison de limiter les effets potentiels de l'œuvre. Supposer d'ailleurs que l'intention est encore à découvrir, c'est poser ou bien que le poème l'a trahie, qu'il est un échec, ou bien que les vraies valeurs littéraires le dépassent.

Même si elle se bornait à relever ces travaux, la *Bibliographie* n'en serait pas moins indispensable; si imparfaits soient-ils, ils forment peu à peu un corpus de faits de style, pour des textes sur lesquels on n'avait, il y a quelques années, que des études de "fond" ou des commentaires historiques et philologiques.

Mais M. Le Hir a su aller plus loin, et c'est par là qu'il nous fait apercevoir les signes avant-coureurs d'une prochaine révolution de la stylistique. Il inclut des études représentatives du second groupe, celui des linguistes structuralistes, c'est-à-dire surtout des chercheurs des Etats-Unis et du "bloc communiste" (à l'exception des Roumains, qui restent divisés entre les deux camps)—slavisants pour la plupart. Ce groupe se refuse à interpréter les intentions, et il s'en tient strictement aux textes. Ceux-ci, et les états de langue qu'ils représentent, sont considérés comme relevant des techniques de la dialectologie; on essaie de définir leurs structures en termes purement formels. Le poème, étudié plutôt du point de vue de son destinataire que de celui de son auteur, n'est qu'un cas particulier de message linguistique auquel peut s'appliquer la théorie de l'information.

M. Le Hir n'a guère pu enregistrer cet apport nouveau que dans les chapitres de stylistique générale—et pour cause. Surtout il a dû citer des travaux étrangers au domaine roman, comme l'étude de V. Erlich sur le formalisme russe, ou encore *Style in Language* de Sebeok. Mais ce recueil est la première somme théorique de la stylistique réformée et ses conclusions sont applicables à toute stylistique (voir les discussions de Y. Malkiel, à paraître dans *IJAL*, 1962; K. Uitti, *RPh*, XV [1962], 424-38; Riffaterre, *Word*, XVII [1961], 318-44) et il serait vain de croire que les principes de l'analyse stylistique puissent différer d'un groupe de langues à l'autre. Il ne fait guère de doute que la *Bibliographie* devenue, on l'espère, périodique, enregistrera une évolution des romanistes européens vers notre bord: les premières discussions de la nouvelle Société d'étude de la langue française, à Paris (voir *FM*, XXX [1962], 52) indiquent que le glissement a commencé.

Chaque titre est accompagné d'un commentaire rapide mais sûr où transparaît souvent l'ironie incisive de M. Le Hir. On le trouvera constamment utile (la présentation est aussi plus claire que celle des éditions précédentes), mais

pas toujours aussi instructif qu'on l'attend d'une bibliographie critique. À côté de résumés abondants pour des ouvrages d'intérêt limité (e.g., nos. 1005, 1665—mais c'est peut-être une inégalité due à des collaborations extérieures sur des points de détail), on passe trop rapidement sur des ouvrages qui posent des problèmes fondamentaux comme la *Psychologie des styles* de Morier, qu'il faudrait au moins rattacher à la caractérologie, ou sur des traités prématurés, dont l'échec devait être souligné, comme la *Petite Histoire* de Ch. Bruneau ou la *Langue cultivée* d'A. François. Il y a des remarques, sur l'attitude historique, sur l'emploi des statistiques, ou des emplois de termes comme *métastylistique* (p. 109), *métalinguistique* (p. 208), sans parler de curiosités comme le *semi-chiasme* (ibid.), qui demeurent énigmatiques, faute d'un exposé des principes critiques sur lesquels ils se fondent. Un *index rerum*, avec quelques définitions, serait utile. Il permettrait aussi aux stylisticiens d'obédience linguistique de s'y reconnaître dans le maquis grécisant de la terminologie traditionnelle. Trop souvent les jugements portés se réduisent à des exclamations ou à des notes du type "étude littéraire et psychologique surtout, sympathique et informée" (p. 129), qui ne nous mènent pas loin. Ne vaudrait-il pas mieux citer les comptes-rendus des ouvrages controversés, relier par des renvois les articles aux discussions qu'ils ont suscitées (la controverse, dans *Essays in Criticism*, sur les vues de Wimsatt permettrait, par exemple, de "rattraper" des travaux antérieurs exclus des éditions précédentes)? L'index des critiques pourrait aisément indiquer les courants et les influences, renvoyer, par exemple, de Bachelard à ses disciples Onimus et J. P. Richard ou à ses exégètes comme M. de Diéguez; rapprocher de ces dernières recherches une évolution qui se dessine dans les études de thèmes et les oriente de plus en plus vers les études d'archétypes, selon la définition de C. G. Jung—évolution qui ne manquera pas de reposer la question des effets de style: peut-il y avoir des valeurs intrinsèques, fondées sur des archétypes, ou les valeurs sont-elles des variables dépendant absolument du contexte? Mais on aurait mauvaise grâce à se plaindre; l'ouvrage est un outil excellent. Quelques omissions: les travaux de W. Fucks (mentionné à travers un disciple, p. 34), B. Mandelbrot, Harry Hoiijer sur la statistique; ceux de Frye (*Sound and Poetry*, 1957), M. Chastaing (*JPs*, LV, 403–23, 461–81), Ratermanis et Deitz (*PQ* XXIV, 413–37), A. W. De Groot (dans le *Manual of Phonetics* de L. Kaiser, 1957), A. Graur (dans le *Recueil d'études romanes* de Bucarest, 1959) sur les rapports de la phonétique et de l'esthétique, et encore ceux de S. Chatman; R. S. Graham sur le bilinguisme dans la création littéraire (*Word*, XII, 370–81); F. J. Carmody sur le vocabulaire de Rimbaud (*FR*, XXXIII, 247–56), et A. C. Taylor sur celui de Jarry (*CAIEF*, XI, 307–22); des exégèses de Verlaine, par A. J. Wright, Jr., (*PMLA*, LXXIV, 268–75), d'Apollinaire, par R. Champigny (*FR*, XXXIII, 123–30), de Góngora, par F. García Lorca (*RR*, XLVII, 13–26). C'est bien peu dans une enquête si étendue, et M. Le Hir a travaillé presque seul. Il a droit à notre reconnaissance et à notre admiration. (MICHAEL RIFFATERRE, *Columbia University*)

La Notion de structure. Par Sem Dresden, Lein Geschiere et Bernard Bray. La Haye: Van Goor Zonen, 1961. Pp. 68. Prononcées sous les auspices de l'As-

sociation hollandaise pour l'encouragement de l'étude du français, les trois conférences que voici précèdent de quelques mois la collection d'articles publiés sous la direction de Roger Bastide sur les *Sens et usages du terme structure dans les sciences humaines et sociales*; autant de signes que les savants européens adoptent de plus en plus des méthodes que l'anthropologie et la linguistique américaines ont mises en honneur. La "Fonction des structures de la phrase française" de L. Geschiere est un titre peut-être un peu ambitieux pour une esquisse, à l'usage du grand public, des principes de la linguistique structurale. On regrettera que Chomsky ne soit pas nommé, qui depuis cinq ans renouvelle l'analyse des structures syntaxiques. L'auteur adopte la "double articulation" de Martinet—mais faudra-t-il réduire l'intonation à n'être qu'un phénomène marginal? Il semble croire que la syntaxe ne va pas au-delà de la phrase et de la coordination de phrases: s'il faut comprendre que la stylistique ne commence qu'au-delà (p. 19), il n'en est rien; la phrase et ses composantes sont aussi de son domaine.

Dans "Critique littéraire et structure," S. Dresden retrace le développement de la critique exclusivement consacrée à l'œuvre en soi, aux dépens de l'histoire littéraire et de la critique biographique. Ce qui justifie cette approche nouvelle, c'est qu'elle ne voit, au fond, dans le poème, qu'un cas particulier de l'acte de communication linguistique, et qu'elle reproduit, pour l'explorer, les conditions mêmes du phénomène étudié: "comme tout autre lecteur, le critique structuraliste n'a qu'un seul point de départ: la lecture aussi consciente que possible d'une œuvre" (p. 48). Le nouveau, en effet, n'est pas d'avoir réintroduit l'étude de l'objet en tant que tel, mais de l'étudier dans sa fonction, dans la manière dont il est perçu, s'impose à l'attention et devient l'expérience personnelle du destinataire de l'énoncé littéraire. Il est dommage que S. Dresden ne dise pas le mérite des New Critics qui ont été ici les initiateurs, et aussi qu'il les affuble du nom d'*impressionnistes* sous prétexte que "ce n'est pas l'œuvre d'art qui les intéresse en premier lieu, mais l'impression qu'elle fait" (p. 38): le mot doit être réservé à la pire espèce de subjectivité. Il y a un certain illogisme à exiger pour l'étude de l'œuvre en soi une exégèse des variantes et à ranimer ainsi la méthode historique (p. 36). L'œuvre littéraire ne peut être que ce que voit le lecteur, pas le travail préparatoire qu'on a voulu d'ailleurs lui cacher. Je ne veux pas dire qu'il faille rejeter les études de genèse; mais elles relèvent de la psychologie en tant qu'elles éclairent le processus créateur, et elles permettent aussi d'étudier un cas de perception de l'œuvre et d'en évaluer les effets, le poète étant aussi le premier lecteur.

Le structuralisme en littérature est à la fois stylistique et thématologique. Dresden, reprenant une idée de L. Nelson, propose une rhétorique de l'ineffable qui étudierait l'ensemble des procédés destinés non pas à exprimer ce qui par définition ne peut l'être, mais à le suggérer: ils ne sont à vrai dire qu'un cas particulier de l'illusion de réalité créée par le langage surtout lorsque cette réalité n'est pas accessible ou imaginable, ou lorsque l'auteur ne se soucie pas de la rendre d'après nature (cf *RR*, LI [1960], 274-75; LIII [1962], 130-32); l'étude de ces illusions relève de la stylistique générale.

B. Bray cherche à prouver, dans "La Notion de structure et le nouveau roman," qu'il y a affinité d'essence entre ce dernier et la critique structuraliste, parce que le roman nouveau se passe de la réalité spatiale et temporelle ex-

térieure, la seule qui donne prise à la critique historique; le structuralisme, en revanche, ne pourrait rendre compte des romans où la référence à la réalité est exprimée et où il y a consubstantialité de l'auteur, des personnages et du lecteur, comme les romans de Stendhal ou Balzac. Sans contester qu'il y ait affaiblissement de la fonction référentielle dans le nouveau roman (ce terme de fonction sert à décrire la communication linguistique et par conséquent s'applique aussi à l'expression littéraire)—ce qui d'ailleurs est plus vrai d'un Beckett que d'un Butor—cette thèse ne me paraît défendable que si l'on ne devait appeler *structure* que celle des romans où tout, y compris la référence à l'espace et au temps, est motivé par les exigences internes, les lois de l'œuvre. Mais ce serait un contresens: *structure* signifie aussi bien une construction qui comprend les coordonnées spatiale et temporelle. Dans *Atala*, la scène de la mort de l'héroïne n'est accessible, nous dit-on, qu'à la critique historique, à cause de références à l'histoire. Mais ces références, elles sont encodées dans le message, donc accessibles à la stylistique: l'histoire n'échappe pas à la critique structurale, tant qu'elle est *dans le texte*, noir sur blanc. De même pour la consubstantialité mentionnée plus haut: si nous ne la percevons que grâce à ce que nous apprennent les historiens, hors texte, elle n'est point pertinente à l'œuvre en soi; mais si elle est *exprimée* (ce qui correspond aux fonctions émotionnelle et conative de Jakobson), elle est descriptible en termes de structure. (MICHAEL RIFFATERRE, *Columbia University*)

Medieval Cultural Tradition in Dante's "Comedy." By Joseph Anthony Mazzeo. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1960. Pp. xi + 260. Mr. Mazzeo continues in this volume the study of the cultural context of the *Comedy* began in his *Structure and Thought in the Paradiso*. He is particularly concerned to ally Dante with the elements of Christianity absorbed from Platonism and Neoplatonism as distinguished from Thomistic formulations. The two subjects which receive extended treatment are the method of analogy and the doctrine that light constitutes the unique principle of being and of knowledge. They are related because Mr. Mazzeo studies analogies based on the model of hierarchy and then points out the hierarchical organization of the "light metaphysics." Applied to the *Comedy*, these principles have two results. First, the poem's structural principle is said to reside in them: "the poem is a carefully ordered hierarchy of lights and shadows" (p. 56). "... Dante's imagery of light was not conceived as more or less adequate representation of a reality whose real nature is conceptual and imageless, but as a literal description of that reality" (p. 57). Second, they furnished Dante with a conception of poetry different from any previously held:

"If Dante's theory of beauty in nature and the visual arts is one of imitation or participation in a divine or natural beauty, respectively, his conception of poetry is that a true poem is participation in divine wisdom and that its function is the salvation of himself and others. ... The poet is the scribe of the Holy Spirit, the only true creative Agent in existence, and from Him come truly new images. Hence the novelty of the poem to which Dante so often calls our attention, especially by invoking supernatural aid and lamenting his inability to render his vision fully.

"In this conception of poetry, Dante departs from the main current of medieval theory, usually an elaboration of the Horatian notion of *ut pictura poesis*. Both painting and poetry were generally thought to present us with "descriptions" of the ideal beauty of the world of sense. This conception of poetry was a part of a scheme according to which there were three modes of contemplating the beauty of the world. The first way, exemplified by Hugh of St. Victor and the poets, was to see it with the eyes of the flesh, to delight in its very visibility. A second and higher mode was to see it as does the thinker, permeated with order, regularity, and harmony. The Chartrians were pre-eminent among those who saw it in this manner. The third and highest mode was to see the universe's beauty with the eyes of the spirit, whereby one saw everywhere in the created universe spiritual significations and analogies. Such were St. Bernard, the Victorine mystics, and St. Bonaventura.

"It is obvious that the *Divine Comedy* includes all these modes of vision and does not stop at the purely descriptive or visual mode which was all that the creation analogies of Dante's time could offer poetic theory." (p. 171)

It is manifestly unfair to divorce Mr. Mazzeo's conclusions from the evidence and argument which lead to them, but the quoted passages will make it clear that the book is for the specialist rather than the general reader. The problems posed are very delicate and control of the proposed solutions requires erudition and judgment sufficient for answering three kinds of questions: are the historical statements true, are the theoretic formulations accurate, is the interpretation of the poem just? Each of them requires minute and extended inquiry, and not the least of this work's merits will be that it forces a re-examination of fundamental issues. (EDWARD WILLIAMSON, *Wesleyan University*)

La Religion de Marot. Par C. A. Mayer, Genève: Droz, 1960, Pp. 186. After clearing Marot's name of the usual and oft-repeated accusations of lightheartedness, instability and cowardice (Introduction), Mayer follows the poet through the vicissitudes of his later life in the light of the documents pertaining and related to his reputation as a "Lutheran." The second half of the book deals with a minute examination of Marot's literary output throwing in bold relief the then trite but sharp criticisms of the ways of the church. Thus Mayer backs up the first half, the historical part of his investigation. This method is both sound and safe.

What we know of Marot's life is practically limited to the sequences of brushes he had with the ecclesiastical authorities from 1526 on, and until his death away from his homeland. The Sorbonne and its inquisitors, though derided by their opponents, knew well the men and the kind of men who would have welcomed in Francis I's kingdom the revolution Henry VIII was going to bring about in England. Mayer is right when he takes earnestly the evidence furnished by Marot's foes. This evidence was significant and damaging in the hands of the prosecutor; it was not to be taken lightly by Marot. That evidence coming from friends or sympathisers is of course meager or simply not to be had, since silence was a safer policy.

Are we now discovering—after the diligent works of Villey, Becker, Jourda, Leblanc especially—a new Marot, a religious Marot? This is not the purpose of this study which underscores 1) the anti-monastic attitude of the poet (a meaningful and symptomatic criticism common to all “philoneists” then, including a great many Catholics especially in the upper hierarchy); 2) the jibes at priests, monks, the Pope, the Sorbonne and its men; 3) finally Mayer points out the poet’s negative views on the issues of Purgatory, Lent and, generally, good works, and, consequently, his acceptance of the doctrine of justification by Faith alone. All this, let us recall, is incidental in the literary production of Marot, and superfluous to add here, all this is in keeping with a fiery opposition to the “man-made constitutions of the Church,” as used to be sharply argued around 1530. Such an “evangelical” and resolute attitude was to be expected from a man keeping the company that we know better now thanks to Mayer. However, it is still thin evidence (for today’s scholar) to draw clear-cut conclusions as to the religion of a man whose only truly religious poem is *La Déploration de Florimond Robertet* on the fundamental theme of death, source of man’s metaphysical anxieties. Mayer is perhaps too blunt when he affirms with scholarly intuition indeed and light proofs “. . . Marot fut un ennemi implacable de l’église catholique” (p. 122), because we simply do not know what Marot’s *Credo* was.

The usefulness of this study lies not so much in its conclusions as in the logical grouping in a single volume of all the documentation and facts shedding light or shadows on Marot’s troubles and woes for religion’s sake. Undeniably, the man, as so many then, was hounded and prosecuted for his religion. This is obvious, but there are times when the obvious is overlooked and when the features of an author are beclouded by time-hallowed opinions. Mayer does his very best to look at Marot with the eyes of a contemporary and must needs remind us that his life and works were condemned by the “old timers,” though he did not fare any better at the hands of the Calvinists, thus finding himself between the Devil and the deep blue sea. In this respect, his case reminds us of Rabelais; still Alcofribas seems to have suffered much less discomfort than his friend Marot.

At the outset of his book, Mayer states that Marot was not a theologian; he means, of course, he was not a professional theologian. Neither was Thomas More for that matter, nor Rabelais. Mayer is unfair both to himself and potential readers of his book, for critics may take advantage of this candor. Let us realize, once and for all, that any intelligent and articulate man might think of himself as a theologian in those days, even though he had never studied theology as such in a theological school, just as today anybody able to read and write is apt to look upon himself as a politician and even as a statesman. . . . This is the irony and tragedy of our times; so it was in Marot’s time.

Mayer’s serious book may disturb previous and traditionally comfortable ways of judging Marot. So much the better. We feel now that we know Marot, the man, better; Marot, the author, will profit by it, for his vaunted “badinage” used to arouse overwhelming prejudices pro and con. Mayer is right in placing his poet squarely in the religious ambiance of men who had the courage or, as in Marot’s case, the pluck and foolhardiness of criticising the old

ways tauntingly and carpingly. Marot was witty, and wit, in the early days of the religious upheaval, usually was the spearhead of new ideas. Nevertheless wit, witticisms, raillery, and fawning for court favors are not the essential intellectual habits needed for a theological or merely religious attitude. Mayer finds very little in Marot which might give substance to a metaphysical concept of man. Turning Marot into a deep thinker would be a futile endeavor, and it is a pity that the Reformation did not give rise, in France, to a great religious poet, as another Calvin might have been.

Marot followed the trends and new fads of his day, and jumped on the band wagon. Still it is true that he would certainly have remained just another "grand rhétoriqueur" and probably the greatest of them all, had it not been for the religious turmoil which revealed him to himself in spite of his literary bents, talent and spiritual shortcomings. (EMILE V. TELLE, *Catholic University*)

Ronsard, Poet of Nature. By D. B. Wilson. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1961. Pp. vii + 164. This monograph is at once much more and much less than the title promises. As "only the second book on Ronsard to be published in Great Britain during this century," it was naturally awaited with considerable interest but neither specialists nor students of French poetry in general are likely to be satisfied with most of the volume.

Dr. Wilson begins by analyzing the various meanings of the word "Nature" (pp. 1-8), then goes on to consider Ronsard's descriptive treatment of nature (*natura naturata*) (pp. 9-58), his idea of nature as a controlling force (*natura naturans*) (pp. 59-88) and finally nature as inclination or temperament in the poet himself (pp. 89-118). There is a general conclusion (pp. 119-27) and an appendix of relatively short characteristic poems illustrating these various aspects of "Nature" (pp. 128-59).

In the chapter dealing with the description of nature, we find an overlong introduction in which are evoked the names of Jean Lemaire de Belges, Gilles Corrozet, Charles de Sainte-Marthe, Marot, Des Périers, Peletier du Mans, etc. The brief examples cited are no doubt meant to help situate Ronsard's method in its proper setting but the connection is far from clear. The author tells us, incidentally, that he does not intend to provide a comprehensive treatment or a repertoire of themes and that he is not really concerned with sources (even though he goes on to mention Horace [pp. 19, 25, 33], Virgil [p. 28], Plutarch [p. 65], Petrararch [pp. 39, 40], Pliny and Pierre Belon [p. 115]). His consideration of the various poems is roughly chronological and he traces in Ronsard the evolution of a personal lyricism marked by a definite change in style about 1555-1556.

The best part of the study is undoubtedly in the section on Nature as a controlling force (pp. 82-86). Elsewhere, one feels that lip-service is being paid to the current catch-words of literary criticism: tension (p. v), dichotomy (pp. 4, 88), myth (p. 123), baroque (pp. 31, 65, 104, 118, 124) and especially symbol and symbolism. In this section, however, the analysis of the relation between God and Nature, between Man and Destiny is particularly enlightening.

In such a compact volume, it is annoying to find a number of unnecessary repetitions: the image of the poet as a bee gathering honey or pollen from a

variety of flowers (pp. 2, 115); Desonay's statement that "Mouvement égale lyrisme: nous en revenons toujours là" (pp. 48, 55); the alternance in the poet of spleen and melancholy (pp. 94, 121); the statement that Ronsard only once used the commonplace contrast between Nature *mère* and *marâtre* (pp. 4, 122), etc.

Most distressing of all, however, are lapses in style which seem to reveal an insensitivity to language quite inappropriate in a critic writing about poetry. One hesitates to mention them, but there are so many that they cannot pass unnoticed. Can precision and conciseness be *wooded* with success (p. 22)? Is it possible to "catch a glimpse of the sweep" of later poems (p. 25) or "look hard for the musical effect" of a passage (p. 10)? Can a poem be "tied down to earth by a certain sprinkling of realistic detail so that it hovers, as it were, between the world of appearances and that of imagination" (p. 29)? How does the "winding together of a skein of different types of movement . . . form a living and moving backcloth" (p. 34)? There are many other examples of this sort of thing, but let us note finally the extraordinary mixture of metaphor in the following awkward sentence: "The enrichment which Corrozet seems to contemplate and which Ronsard is to add was certainly organized according to some central motive and the type of description we shall find in Ronsard's work is governed, not by the desire for length, but by the desire for coherent and concise grouping around a symbol or a feeling, by the wish that the poem should follow, not its own head, but a path determined by neo-classical laws of composition or perhaps by the temperament of the poet, each part of the poem being enriched and coloured in the same vein" (pp. 13-14).

The convenient size of this volume, its attractive format and its title all promised delight. It is depressing to have to state that on the whole it is a disappointment. (VICTOR E. GRAHAM, *University of Toronto*)

Ronsard. Par Raymond Lebègue. Troisième édition, revue et augmentée. (Connaissance des Lettres, 29.) Paris: Hatier, 1961. Pp. 176. The first edition of this book appeared in 1950 under the title of *Ronsard, l'homme et l'œuvre* and was discussed by the present reviewer in *Renaissance News*, V (1962), 15-16. The sole and, I think, sufficient justification for renewing the discussion here may be found in M. Lebègue's *Avant-propos* to this new edition: "Associé depuis la mort de P. Laumonier à l'achèvement . . . de la seule édition complète, j'ai fait profiter cette réédition des travaux récemment parus et de mes recherches sur les derniers recueils de Ronsard." Not only students of French poetry of the sixteenth century, but a much wider public, will be interested in knowing how this latest edition, the third in a little over ten years, of a highly readable though compact book on Ronsard by one of the leading scholars of the French Renaissance, differs from the two earlier ones.

We leave aside the minor changes affecting an occasional sentence or slightly modifying a date. In all, about twenty passages are sufficiently amplified to solicit attention.

Three or four of these dwell somewhat more than was formerly the case on Ronsard's relations with the Court: his participation in 1571 at Charles IX's entry into Paris, and in 1573 at the reception for the Polish ambassadors who

had come to inform the future Henri III of his election to the Polish throne (p. 92); his anger at the moral decline of the Court and his cultivation of satiric poetry as a means, whose futility was later to become evident, of arresting its deterioration (p. 96); his deliberate employment of a large part of the fourth book of the *Franciade* to place before the eyes of Charles IX and of the Court an admonitory history of the royal houses of France to serve as a new and more urgent *Institution pour l'adolescence du Roy* (p. 98). Closely related to the foregoing is an excellent passage on Ronsard's expressive silence after the Saint Bartholomew massacre. The poet thus dissociated himself spiritually from one of the blackest crimes that disfigure the pages of French history, and distinguished himself from lesser writers who willingly became the apologists of this treacherous attempt to extirpate French Protestantism (p. 95).

Ronsard sought relief from the oppressive life at Court by escaping to his priories at Saint-Cosme and Croixval. In Chapter IX, on "Ronsard en sa province," the end of which is entirely transformed, M. Lebègue develops more amply his account of the peaceful life that the poet led in 1569 in the countryside of Tours and Vendôme among his books or employed at his favorite occupation of gardening (pp. 108-10; cf. p. 136).

At this time, "Il oublie Marie de Bourgueil; mais . . . son amour pour Cassandre se ranime 'plus obstiné qu'il n'était paravant'" (p. 109). The author is aware that a poet's love is commanded by Eros in the service of Apollo, and that Ronsard, in singing of his passion for Cassandre, Marie, and Hélène, "a songé surtout à faire œuvre d'art" (p. 145). Yet M. Lebègue, fully aware of the importance that Ronsard assigns to significance in poetry (pp. 152-53), avoids a "Paradoxe sur le poète" which would exhaust poetry of expressive sincerity and reduce it to a rhythmic iridescence of enchanting nonsense.

Two new observations on Ronsard's debt to antiquity are interesting and valuable. The first underscores Ronsard's appreciation of Lucretius: "il qualifie de 'divins' certains vers du poète latin, et il utilise les mythes et maint passage du *De Natura* . . ." (p. 47); the second emphasizes the living quality of Ronsard's use of mythology (p. 154) which is a searching test of a poet's ability to identify himself with what is most characteristic of both the literary and plastic arts of Greece and Rome.

A paragraph (p. 160) on the music written for Ronsard's poetry by his contemporaries has been completely revised, and a new one introduced (p. 126-27) on the modern composers who have set Ronsard to music. Additional comments on Ronsard's versification stress his rigorous observance of the principle of the alternation of masculine and feminine rhymes in the collective editions of 1578 and 1584 (p. 160), and his contribution to the development of the decasyllable and the alexandrine (p. 158).

Finally, three passages enlarge the discussion of the fortune of Ronsard's poetry in later times. Of these, one is of particular interest because it was written by Pellisson at a time (c. 1650) when the glory of Ronsard was in relative eclipse: "Je me suis amusé quelques jours, ce que vous auriez peut-être peine à deviner, aux poésies de notre bon Ronsard, et ne m'en suis point repenti, y ayant trouvé une infinité de choses qui valent bien mieux, à mon avis, que la politesse stérile et rampante de ceux qui sont venus depuis. Quant

à lui, il est poète, non seulement dans la rime et la cadence, mais dans l'expression, et dans la pensée . . ." (p. 123, n. 2).

The bibliography has been augmented and brought up to date, and a useful chronology has been added. (ISIDORE SILVER, *Washington University*)

The Early Public Theatre in France. By William L. Wiley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960. Pp. xii + 326. W. L. Wiley, author of *The Gentleman of Renaissance France*, published in 1954, has written a highly readable, engrossing and finely documented work on *The Early Public Theatre in France*. Drawing materials from Pierre de L'Estoile's *Mémoires-Journaux*, Bas-sompierre's *Mémoires*, *Recueil des Gazettes nouvelles* by Renaudot, Mahelot's *Mémoire*, *Histoire du théâtre français* by Les Frères Parfaict, as well as other invaluable sources, the author has succeeded in giving us a comprehensive and living account of the French theatre from 1580 to 1630.

Mr. Wiley wisely begins his survey with a brief historical sketch of the turbulent days when the French theatre was on the eve of its golden age. We witness the completion, under the aegis of Henry IV, of the Pont Neuf and of the Place Dauphine, where charlatans congregated, together with herb and nostrum salesmen, mountebanks and entertainers such as Tabarin and his brother Mondor. The author traces the development, under Louis XIII, of the marshland and vegetable gardens of the Marais, which later were to become the site of the Théâtre du Marais. Then there follows a detailed description of the Halles where farces were given by semi-professional actors in some unoccupied stall. A little more than two blocks north of Paris' public market stood "the famous and dilapidated Hôtel de Bourgogne."

To attend theatre in the 17th century was not always a pleasant experience. The future Louis XIII, on one occasion, "was taken to the Hôtel de Bourgogne at four o'clock; brought back at eight o'clock completely congealed with cold." The theatre in those days was damp, icy and poorly adapted to the production of plays. Even in the loges, one needed to have "perfect senses of seeing and hearing" in order to enjoy the performances. The audiences in the "parterre" were frequently rowdy, boisterous, given to dueling or drawn to the appetizing array of "macaroons, bread, wine" offered by the widow Dellin.

The intricate and involved peregrinations of the early troupes are next drawn into focus. The Italian companies, I Gelosi and that of Battista Lazzaro, which did so much to inculcate a taste for theatre all over France, appealed not only to the populace because of their spirit of buffoonery and their pantomimic techniques, but also to such personages as Henry III, Catherine de Medici and Henry IV. Succeeding troupes of actors experienced both triumphs and failures: such as those of Agnan Sarat, Jehan Courtin and Nicolas Poteau, Adrien Talmy and his "compagnie de comédiens français," Valleran le Conte who was "marvelous in his parts," and his "troupe du Roi." One of Valleran's most notable achievements was the training of young men and women in the theatrical profession. But the Parisians preferred the rough and bawdy farces of Gautier Garguille, who could "twist like a real marionette," the antics of Turlupin, and Gros Guillaume who was so fat that he walked a considerable

distance behind his belly, to the more serious works of Alexandre Hardy which Valleran produced.

Mr. Wiley discusses the plight of the actors, their loosely organized companies, their financial and social positions. A defender of the acting profession appeared early in the seventeenth century in the person of Bruscambille, a comedian at the Hôtel de Bourgogne, who wrote, "... See the essential rightness of their cause, do not allow them to be slandered, and they will be grateful to you forever."

A nostalgic chapter on the theatrical quarters of Paris is followed by a history of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and its lay-out; the conversion of some of the two hundred and fifty-odd *jeux de paume* into theatres; a discussion of stage machinery and the reduced use of mansion sets; the role of the stage designer and stage hand; the place of advertising in theatrical productions; the role of the "portier" who collected admissions at the risk of his life; theatrical productions at court; the types of plays produced and Richelieu and reform.

Carefully selected illustrations featuring Arlequin, Tabarin's street show, Mahelot's drawing for the set of Hardy's *La Folie de Clidamant* and Du Ryer's *Lisandre et Caliste*, to mention but a few, contribute greatly in giving life and color to this half century of French theatre, which, in spite of "its grossness and gropings, was a stepping stone to an era of theatrical magnificence." (BETTINA L. KNAPP, *Hunter College*)

French Classical Literature: An Essay. By Will G. Moore. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1961. Pp. 174. Mr. Moore has added to the increasing number of studies meaning to rescue the French seventeenth century and classicism from the textbooks. As Prof. Nathan Edelman, the editor of the recently published seventeenth-century volume of the *Critical Bibliography of French Literature* (Syracuse U. Press, 1961), remarks, every aspect of the century of classicism and of the baroque is being subjected to fresh scrutiny. So Mr. Moore, after stating the case for revision, examines in a series of essays the principal writers of the period as they pursue poetry, romance, tragedy, comedy, persuasion, wit, and social portraiture. In each case he attempts to see them in their own perspective, as it were, as well as in ours. This approach summons up many problems, poses many questions and suggest many answers. The book thus becomes a sort of conversation between Mr. Moore and the reader, it being understood that the reader already knows enough about the century to be able to engage in that conversation, and even to disagree with some of Mr. Moore's assumptions and conclusions while enjoying the whole endeavor.

"The Pursuit of Poetry" wants to escape the limits romanticism has put upon our conception of poetry in order to see it "in the larger context, in the roving inspiration" (p. 38), not only in the "lyrical bits" of La Fontaine but in the fleeting masks of Molière. "The Renewal of Romance" seeks to recapture the urgency and meaning of those lengthy novels Boileau and others made such fun of, but which after all were very widely read, and to free them from the judgment of a bored Saintsbury and to understand them in terms of their connection with other forms of literature and with the life of society.

The discussion of the serious novel is illuminating: Mme de La Fayette is shown as inheriting but transforming the tradition of the romance. However, Scarron and Furetière are set aside as having nothing to do with classicism.

Mr. Moore's fourth chapter, entitled "The Recovery of Tragedy," deals, naturally, with Corneille and Racine. There is expressed some doubt about where to situate Corneille in the relation to tragedy, but none at all about his having created the "instrument" used by Racine to recover tragedy whole. This meant creating a new genre which expresses finally the modern sense of human mystery and paradox.

When it comes to Molière, in "The Discovery of Comedy," the treatment is at once sensitive and firm as we might expect from one who has already done a stimulating longer study of the subject (*Molière* [Oxford, 1949]). Much of what is said rests on a distinction between comedy and satire with Molière securely placed on the side of comedy, perhaps because Mr. Moore refuses to accept for him the traditional conception of satire as "corrective." This in turn has to do, no doubt, with what Mr. Moore quite rightly sees as Molière's underlying affection for his ridiculous characters.

A chapter follows on the prose writing of the period. Here many of the observations are eminently worthwhile especially in relating Pascal's earlier works to the *Pensées* and in analysing with some skill the style and the organisation of the thought. Mr. Moore shows also how Bossuet's quite different writing fits equally well the temper of the times, how in short it is "classic." I am grateful for the quotation from Bossuet's moving meditation composed for Louise de Luynes (pp. 115-16): a whole book could be written on what it implies about the seventeenth-century concept of the *person*, a concept that needs much thinking about before we can come near to understanding the whole moment of classicism.

Then there is a chapter on La Rochefoucauld and La Bruyère with useful remarks on the attitudes underlying the formation of their kind of writing and its relation to the epigram. Further, Mr. Moore points to what he sees as La Rochefoucauld's two "discoveries": complexity of human motive, and the unconscious. But for both writers the stress is on the search for brevity—after all, the title of the chapter is "The Soul of Wit." This laudable concern to see the artist rather than the moralist is carried over into the following essay on Retz, Mme de Sévigné and Saint-Simon, the real historians of the age, and magnificent writers, all three.

The conclusion, called "The Shape of an Attitude," describes the period's sense of human achievement and its equally lively sense of human limitations. It reminds us of the Christian structure within which the work of classicism was done and the respect for elegance and dignity which presided over that work, all of this being viewed with awe as rooted in the mystery of artistic creation.

Now some samples of the conversation with Mr. Moore:

1. I don't think Scarron and Furetière can be set aside as having nothing to do with classicism. Their reaction against the artificiality of the romance was surely part of the formation of anti-manneristic classic taste.

2. I don't believe *Phèdre* and *la Princesse de Clèves* can be comfortably

thought of as representing "the same tragic condition" (p. 60). If the novel probes "the coexistence of passion and the marriage bond," this is already a step away from the romance, from myth, from tragedy. Compared with *Phèdre*, *la Princesse de Clèves* is almost bourgeois. Else why all the discussion about the *aveu*? It is amusing that at the end of the first part of the *Roman bourgeois* (1666), Furetière writes of Lucrèce and Nicodème after their marriage: "S'ils vescuient bien ou mal ensemble, vous le pourriez voir quelque jour, si la mode vient d'écrire la vie des femmes mariées."

3. Why does Mr. Moore say about *Phèdre*, "the human scene is never, as in Racine's previous plays always, the whole of the picture" (p. 78)? What about *La Thébaine*, *Andromaque*, *Iphigénie*? And why, of Racine and *Phèdre*, "Of all his works, this was the one in which the process of art had illumined rather than falsified the suggestion of humanity" (p. 79)?

4. I find it difficult and unnecessary to distinguish between satire and comedy, especially in the case of Molière. Whatever he was doing he thought he was making fun of certain people: *jouer* was his word. See the preface to *Tartuffe*. In any case, I think satire can be affectionate as well as malicious.

5. I am puzzled when Mr. Moore thinks Pascal did not aim to be literary (p. 101). I should say he aimed to be literary in the best sense according to the developing taste of the period. "La vraie éloquence se moque de l'éloquence," he said and since he cared for "la vraie éloquence" he came to be, as Mr. Moore says, a "chief exponent of classicism." I am puzzled also by the complaint that Pascal has been read mainly as devotional literature and that the wider aspects of his writing have been studied hardly at all. The *Pensées* have been read as epic, tragic, lyric, pre-Hegelian dialectic, existentialist, personal confession, and so on. Is it not enough (nay, too much) that he should have been compared to Aeschylus and Shakespeare? (See Dorothy Margaret Eastwood, *The Revival of Pascal*, [London, 1936].)

6. In connection with La Rochefoucauld's "discovery" of the unconscious, Mr. Moore says that the age "knew nothing of the unconscious elements in behaviour. Its theory of conduct was cut and dried: all action was either ascribed to by the mind, or it was ascribed to occult and supernatural forces" (p. 127). This view was undoubtedly held by some, but it should be remembered that as early as 1657 Nicole was discussing (with Pascal, apparently, and others) a theory of "les pensées imperceptibles" in opposition to the theory of conduct Mr. Moore ascribes to the age. This discussion had to do with the operation of grace, but it had also to do with the way the mind works. (See G. Chinard, *En lisant Pascal* [Genève: Droz, 1948], pp. 119 ff.)

7. Mr. Moore's commendable aestheticism is offset by a strange positivist yearning; these meet in such a passage as the following, where, after deploring the lack of critical attention and control in the field of classical literature, he says, "a masterpiece of comedy can be called a satire, simply because the domains of comedy and satire have not been patiently worked out and established" (p. 10). Who on earth is ever to do this to everyone's eternal satisfaction? The seventeenth century did not. In a book designed to combat an oversimplified view of French classicism, this categorical urge is ironic.

Even so, Mr. Moore's seventeenth century emerges as a bold and energetic

period, a period, as the chapter titles indicate, of renewal and discovery. And this is all to the good. (E. B. O. BORGERHOFF, *Princeton University*)

Rousseau par lui-même. Par Georges May. (Ecrivains de toujours.) Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1961. Pp. 189. In his *Rousseau par lui-même*, Mr. Georges May has not undertaken a simple task. In his first sentence he acknowledges the difficulties involved. "Retrouver la continuité vivante de l'existence d'un homme n'est jamais chose aisée," he writes. Having recognized his difficulties, he proceeds to give himself additional aims. He expresses the desire to grasp "le mouvement même de la vie," to be able to seize "les significations profondes de l'œuvre de Rousseau," to go beyond the knowledge of the famous moments and to penetrate "l'intelligence des grands courants et des grands tournants de l'existence qui les traverse." Finally, he promises to identify with precision "les grands moments décisifs."

Whatever one may say about the work of Professor May, it is tremendously ambitious, and offers novel interpretations provocative of discussion. Mr. May has endeavored to take the fundamental problem of Rousseau's unity and study it in his own original way. This particular problem has been in our generation foremost in Rousseau studies, having been treated by Lanson, Schinz, Cassirer, and more recently by Burgelin and Starobinski. Mr. May's presentation will have to be compared ultimately with these very powerful and, in many instances, much longer treatises. It may well be that it will be found less satisfactory than some of the others, but it will not be found unworthy of comparison. It is imprudent to undertake a task of these dimensions when one is limited to the short space allotted in the "Ecrivains de toujours" series. This limited space is curtailed further, since the author is forced to utilize a fair amount of it for illustrations (which, incidentally, are excellent), for straight biographical material (which, to say the least, is adequate), and for selections from Rousseau (which have been chosen with care). Once the requirements of the format are satisfied, there is not much space remaining to develop a thesis concerning the unity of Rousseau's work.

None the less, Mr. May proceeds with an ease which, to those of us who struggle in a more pedestrian way with literary problems, is admirable. He writes remarkably well, with surprising control of his complex material, often with novel insights into Rousseau's genius and on many occasions very persuasively indeed. True, he allows his interest in Rousseau's amorous affairs and eroticism to contravene any desire to bring out the unity which he sets out to establish. Indeed, Rousseau's life is related as if it were a mere function of these interests and there is a whole chapter, "Femme Réelles et Femmes Rêvées," in which Mr. May returns to the theme with almost embarrassing insistence. To be sure, these matters are important as Professor Starobinski has shown in his rich *La Transparence et l'obstacle*, but they do not occupy the central position in Rousseau's production.

Mr. May does not accept the normal manner of presenting Rousseau's career in five periods (youth, 1712-28; with Mme de Warens, 1728-40; preparation in Paris, 1740-49; the great works, 1749-62; the defense of doctrine, 1762-78). Instead, he has divided the life into four periods: *Indétermination*, 1712-32;

Ambition, 1732-50; *Prédication*, 1751-62; and *Expiation*, 1762-78. Each period is divided symmetrically into two sections: *Indétermination* into "Enfance genevoise" and "Adolescence savoyarde"; *Ambition*, into "Musique, pédagogie, et diplomatie" and "A la conquête de Paris"; *Prédication*, into "Six années parisiennes" and "Six années montmorenciennes"; and *Expiation*, into "Huit années errantes" and "Huit années casanières." Mr. May presents these epochs as they unfold the "decisive moments" as he calls them. It would appear that the affair of the ribbon is a decisive moment, the first meeting with Mme de Warens on Easter Morning, 1728, was not. The journey to Vincennes was, of course, a decisive moment; indeed, Mr. May makes it the very crux of Rousseau's life, just as Rousseau was inclined to do. On the other hand, the establishment at Les Charmettes or the quarrel with Voltaire on the subject of Providence were not decisive moments.

This way of deciding arbitrarily what is decisive and what is not presents a difficulty. Rousseau himself does not help matters since he often refers to episodes of his life as decisive to the point of leaving the impression that every episode related in the *Confessions* brought about a continual succession of decisive moments. In making selections there is thus a risk of distorting things. Thus Mr. May gives a half-line to Les Charmettes, and a full discussion to the ribbon; another half-line to the quarrel over Providence, and a full discussion to the affair of the cherries. We have our preferences, of course, but if we are going to prepare a *Rousseau par lui-même* we have to stick to the rules.

Unfortunately, Rousseau himself does not always stick to the rules. On one occasion, he selected an incident as most decisive. Every one will recall his opinion in the *Confessions* that the position taken in the *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* determined the nature of the other works and thus became the source of his suffering and misery. Mr. May not only accepts this interpretation, he undertakes to explain how this one act created a situation incompatible with all Rousseau stood for, how this unqualified respect for truth and justice was countered by a false position, how he was embarrassed to defend the inconsistencies between his own nature which is good and his thought which is ambiguous and paradoxical. These inconsistencies, according to Mr. May, led to the fourth period of Rousseau's life, that is, the period of "expiation."

Although this interpretation is attractive for its novelty, it brings up a neat problem. How much of Rousseau's explanation of his life and work can the critic judiciously accept? Mr. May seems to take for granted that Rousseau's pronouncements in the "expiation" works (*Confessions*, *Dialogues*, *Rêveries*) will give the key to his doctrinal works. This could well be the case, although it is certainly not self-evident. To do so, these confessional works will have to be controlled most rigidly, not by selecting particular passages and neglecting others. For instance, the passage which Lanson selected from the *Dialogues* as giving the key is never used by Mr. May. On the contrary he has used passages which Lanson has totally neglected.

Mr. May is not content to use this procedure of interpreting the great works of 1749-62 by the confessional works of 1764-78. He attempts likewise to de-

rive them from Rousseau's projected works, that is *La Morale sensitive* and the *Institutions politiques*. This really novel approach is very interesting indeed. Briefly stated, it is an attempt to find out to what extent the *Nouvelle Héloïse* or the *Emile* are *La Morale sensitive* which was projected but never composed. It is imprudent to say that "... sous trois aspects principaux, *La Nouvelle Héloïse* est l'illustration concrète du traité abandonné..." (p. 82) just as it would be risky to infer that the *Social Contract* is a concrete illustration of the *Institutions politiques*. Too much work has been done by Mor-net, Hendel, and others to permit of this over-simplification. None the less, in the genesis of these works, the projected but abandoned works have some importance, and Mr. May must be credited with an intelligent attempt to bring out their significance. (IRA WADE, Princeton University)

Crèveœur's Eighteenth-Century Travels in Pennsylvania and New York. Edited and translated by Percy G. Adams. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1961. Pp. xlv + 172. Crèveœur, an *Illustrious Obscure*, as Hazlitt once called him, has always had a modest place in the history of American colonial literature, but whatever little fame he has is due to only part of his writings. It is to redress this "astonishing" neglect that Professor Percy G. Adams, of the University of Tennessee, offers the present publication to American readers.

Michel Guillaume Jean de Crèveœur, better known as Hector Saint John de Crèveœur, was born at Caen in 1735. In his late teens he joined Montcalm's army in Canada as a mapmaker, but shortly after he asked for his discharge. For several years he wandered through the English colonies, going as far as the Ohio and the Great Lakes. He then decided to settle in the state of New York, where, in 1765, he took out citizenship papers. Four years later, he bought 120 acres of land in Orange County and married. He was a typically successful and prosperous farmer, interested in agricultural improvements and civic affairs. The War of Independence, however, brought him nothing but trouble. He wanted to remain neutral and he was engaged in writing (though he had as yet published nothing): two reasons which made him highly suspicious to both camps. The result was that he spent several months in an English jail in New York. He finally succeeded in extricating himself and he left for Europe where he became famous almost overnight, thanks to the publication of his *Letters from an American Farmer* (of which he soon after published a French version), and was welcomed in the best of "philosophes" circles. Among his many new friends were Madame d'Houdetot, Saint-Lambert, Franklin, Buffon and Turgot. In 1783 he went back to America as French Consul for New York, Connecticut and New Jersey. In July 1790 he left America for the last time and returned to France where he died in 1813.

Before his death, Crèveœur, who was bilingual, had published a massive, three volume *Voyage dans la Haute Pensylvanie et dans l'Etat de New York par un membre adoptif de la Nation Onéida traduit et publié par l'auteur des Lettres d'un Cultivateur Américain* (Paris: Maradan, 1801) which went almost unnoticed both in France and in America and which has since been practically forgotten. It is this work, which in many ways resembles Crèveœur's better known writings (the *Letters* and also the posthumous *Sketches*) which Mr.

Adams wishes to resurrect. We are given, in the present volume, the translation of selected chapters from the *Voyage* together with a lively and scholarly introduction. Even though the text has not been, as Mr. Adams claims (p. xiv), "heretofore unpublished in English" (three chapters—also reproduced by Mr. Adams—were published by Dwight L. Akers and three collaborators, first as a serial in the *Times Herald* of Middletown, New York, in January, February and March 1937, and then as a pamphlet by the same press) his version is the only one readily available today, the original French text never having been reprinted.

The *Voyage* is a kind of encyclopedia of all that Crèveccœur knew or could learn about America, its people, both the white settlers and the Indians, its geography, its history, its economy, its fauna and flora, its climate, presented in a typically fictitious form so as to appeal to the reader. Crèveccœur, so explains the preface, bought the damaged (of course!) manuscript at Copenhagen where it was on sale among other debris from a recent shipwreck. The author was therefore unknown, save for the transparent enough initials S.J.D.C. The book itself is built very loosely around a trip which the narrator and his companion, Monsieur Herman, a conveniently naïve and inquisitive young German, undertake in the Eastern states.

In the course of this imaginary trip (Crèveccœur was in France at the time it was supposed to have taken place) the travellers visit many places and encounter many people. And there emerges before our eyes a somewhat idealized but amazingly vivid picture of the early settlers and their spirit. Some of his portraits, simple, rapid, direct, reflect both the experiences and the talent of Crèveccœur: Mr. Nadowsky, the Polish doctor who "angered by [the] shameful servitude" of his country left it to find hard work, but also hope, freedom and happiness in what was really a "new" world in the backwoods of Pennsylvania; Colonel Woodhull, the wealthy physiocrat of the Hudson Valley, Mr. Townsend, the owner of the big iron works, who, unable to clear by ordinary methods a piece of land covered with thickets and underbrush, hit upon the idea of pasturing there 300 hungry goats who ate the bark and killed the trees and bushes, or the young misanthropist from Jamaica who hated slavery, or the unnamed Swedish farmer who rejoiced because "I can die without being uneasy about the future of my children, since I am going to leave them in a country of abundance where labor is amply rewarded. They will not be exposed to the shame of begging, to remorse or to the dangers of crime" (p. 36) are all fixed in our memories.

For it must be said that as well as historical value the *Voyage* has literary merit. Crèveccœur knows as well how to tell a story (see for instance the Indian tale of how Agan Matchee Manitou, the Great Spirit, created the first beaver) as how to describe a picturesque scene like Niagara Falls in winter, or evoke the everyday life of everyday people. It is quite a tribute to Mr. Adam's excellent translation that this should be visible in his book. (ADRIENNE D. HYTIER, *Vassar College*)

Madame de Staël: Lettres à Narbonne. Introduction, notes et commentaires par Georges Solovieff. Préface de la Comtesse Jean de Pange. Paris: Gallimard, 1960.

Pp. 560. *Madame de Staël: Lettres à Ribbing*. Etablissement du texte, introduction et notes par Simone Balayé. Préface de la Comtesse Jean de Pange. Paris: Gallimard, 1960. Pp. 463. "Les documents existent... Patience! ils sortiront un jour." Ainsi, nous confie Mme la comtesse de Pange, s'est-elle maintes fois évertuée à tempérer le zèle de qui lui soumettait un ambitieux projet d'exégèse staëlienne ou la pressait d'entreprendre elle-même la biographie "définitive" de son aïeule. Aujourd'hui que, sous une forme particulièrement massive, commence le dégel attendu,¹ elle se félicite à bon droit de ses conseils de sagesse, sans, du reste, assez dire ce que pareil "miracle" doit à son entremise et à sa contribution.

C'est, en effet, un événement d'importance majeure que la publication des lettres de Mme de Staël aux comtes de Narbonne et de Ribbing. Certes, j'hésiterais à proclamer, avec Mme de Pange, que s'en trouvent invalidées toutes les recherches antérieures sur les faits, les gestes et les écrits de Corinne encore jeune, en proie aux affres de la Révolution et de l'amour. Il est certains travaux qui résisteront honorablement à cette épreuve de contrôle, pour la raison que leurs auteurs, tout sevrés de documents qu'ils pussent être, et largement contraints d'étudier "la vie dans l'œuvre," témoignaient d'une perspicacité méritoire, fruit du bon sens et d'un minimum de préjugés. Inversement, la rectitude de nos jugements ne s'accroîtra pas à l'échelle des matériaux disponibles. A rendre Mme de Staël plus vivante, on exacerbe du même coup le climat de controverse où baigne sa renommée. Chroniqueur incorrigiblement tardif, j'ai déjà lu, sur les publications conjointes de M. Solovieff et de Mlle Balayé, sur Mme de Staël amoureuse, sur le démon politique qui la possède, des commentaires somme toute très semblables, et surtout par l'ironie condescendante, à ceux de jadis et de naguère. Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose... A cela près, cependant, que nous allons pouvoir abattre cartes sur table. La vraie perdante en l'affaire est Albertine de Broglie, qu'une sotte pruderie, mi-victorienne, mi-genevoise (à la Suzanne Necker), conduisit à vouloir faire main basse sur la correspondance de sa mère: sur les lettres reçues, il va sans dire, mais aussi sur les lettres envoyées. De la chasse systématique qu'elle institua, il est, que je sache, peu d'exemples dans l'histoire. Il en est peu, en tout cas, qui fussent vouées d'avance à un échec aussi certain. Contraindre Mme de Staël au silence, quelle entreprise! et lier la langue aux chercheurs et curieux, quelle utopie! Ils jasèrent, voilà tout. Le jeu a duré un siècle ou davantage. Or, le voilà, sinon fini, du moins discrédité. Nos débats cesseront désormais de s'appuyer sur commérages et conjectures. Qui plus est, la chose risque d'être vraie, non seulement pour la période ingrate de 1792 à 1797, celle même des lettres à Narbonne et à Ribbing, mais pour le restant des œuvres et des jours de Mme de Staël: car cette énorme liasse épistolaire (255 lettres au total) a, comme l'éclair, la vertu d'éclairer les profondeurs.

Comme l'éclair aussi, elle a jailli de façon imprévisible. Non point tant en

1. En ce qui concerne les lettres à Narbonne, il s'est même opéré sur deux fronts. Mme Béatrice W. Jasinski a donné de ces lettres une édition parallèle à celle de M. Solovieff (Paris: Jean-Jacques Pauvert, 1960, xx + 304 pp., tirage limité). Ce volume constitue, par anticipation, la première partie du tome II de la *Correspondance Générale* de Mme de Staël, à paraître par les soins de Mme Jasinski.

ce qui concerne le dossier Ribbing, dont la trace s'était retrouvée de bonne heure: à un moment donné propriété de Dumas fils, ses vicissitudes furent celles d'un trésor inaccessible jusqu'au jour où il échoua à la Bibliothèque Nationale avec tous les papiers du dramaturge. Les lettres à Narbonne, en revanche, ont eu la destinée la plus fantasque qui se puisse imaginer. Nul ne se résignait à croire qu'elles fussent à jamais perdues, mais nul n'aurait su fournir le moindre indice à leur sujet. Je n'ai pas loisir de conter ici comment les lettres de Mme de Staël, littéralement anonymes puisque ne les distinguait adresse ni signature, suivirent en leur odyssée, jusque dans la collection Albert A. Berg de la Bibliothèque de la Ville de New York, les archives de la famille Burney où elles étaient incorporées. Ce récit n'est pas la partie la moins piquante de la préface de M. Solovieff. Je me permettrai, toutefois, d'évoquer la visite mémorable que me fit ce dernier, en 1956 ou 1957, alors qu'il était jeune fonctionnaire à la dite Bibliothèque de New York. Porteur d'un article récent de *Figaro*, dont l'auteur, M. André Lang, s'écriait après tant d'autres: "Mais où sont donc les lettres à Narbonne?" il l'était aussi d'un cahier d'extraits des mêmes lettres autour desquels, modestement, il comptait bâtir un petit essai académique...

Le petit essai fut écrit: embryon du commentaire explicatif que M. Solovieff a eu l'heureuse idée de disperser au travers de son édition, au lieu d'en alourdir son introduction et ses notes. Le morceau de résistance en était, en est encore, dûment revu et augmenté, le détail du séjour que fit Mme de Staël à Juniper Hall, dans le comté de Surrey, où elle rejoignit Narbonne au début de 1793. Cet exposé d'une trentaine de pages scinde le volume en son milieu, tout comme l'équipée anglaise de Germaine en vint à creuser un hiatus irréparable entre un "avant" où l'espoir régnait encore et un "après" où elle devait connaître toutes les humiliations, toutes les fureurs aussi, de la femme graduellement délaissée. Ainsi, la méthode de M. Solovieff, dont Mme de Pange loue à juste titre l'élégance, aspire à respecter la courbe du drame intime, à en mesurer et rendre sensible la tension; et, par là, elle dépasse, sans mentir aux exigences de l'édition critique, les cadres fréquemment étroits que s'impose celle-ci. Ajoutons que Mlle Balayé, dans la présentation des lettres à Ribbing, a procédé de même, avec le même succès, et malgré le handicap d'une matière moins riche: car le deuxième amour de Mme de Staël n'offre pas, à tout prendre, les extrémités pathétiques et les résonances profondes du premier. Son aventure avec l'énigmatique Suédois est exactement cela: une aventure, pimentée de curiosités et d'arrière-pensées un peu suspectes, dont la moindre n'est point de dépit Narbonne et d'éveiller sa jalousie.² Germaine, toutefois, ne serait point Germaine si elle ne distillait, de l'expérience sensuelle ou sentimentale, jusqu'à la dernière goutte de romanesque qu'elle peut contenir. Après avoir goûté, sur le visage du courtisan français, tout ce que l'air de Versailles y avait mis de grâce et de légèreté, la voilà qui s'éprenait d'un beau ténébreux. Après avoir tremblé pour la sécurité de Narbonne, que sa loyauté monarchique, de près ou de loin, désignait à la vindicte des Jacobins, elle s'attachait à un autre homme traqué, mais traqué, celui-là, pour avoir trempé

2. Cf., par exemple, les confidences scabreuses, et délibérément telles, de la lettre à Narbonne du 25 mai 1794.

dans l'assassinat de son souverain. Tous ingrédients ultra-romantiques, qui viennent à point corser la situation, et dont l'exposé de Mlle Balayé tire le meilleur parti.

Avouons-le: les lettres de Mme de Staël ne confèrent, dans l'ensemble, aucun lustre supplémentaire à sa gloire d'écrivain. Passe pour l'orthographe fantaisiste qui, nul n'en ignore, a d'illustres précédents. Je fais bel et bien allusion à leur abondance hâtive, à l'urgence pragmatique qui les dicte visiblement. Jamais sans doute Mme de Staël épistolière n'imagina que sa correspondance dût être publiée; et cette préoccupation l'eût-elle effleurée, elle aurait été incapable de s'y tenir. Pour enfoncée qu'elle soit dans le XVIII^e siècle, la fille de Suzanne Necker s'en détache sous ce rapport. Ses lettres (non ses livres, assurément), elle les écrit comme elle parle; mais ce langage oral n'est plus tout à fait, la chose vaut peut-être d'être notée, celui qu'elle entendait dans le milieu de son enfance. Avec elle et quoi qu'elle en ait, conversation et correspondance prennent l'allure précipitée qui, de proche en proche, à travers le XIX^e siècle, conduira au déclin de l'une et de l'autre en tant que *genres*—et les transformera en *outils* purs et simples. Aujourd'hui, n'en doutons pas, Mme de Staël n'aurait cure des lenteurs de la poste et prodiguerait ses réflexions, ses avis, ses épanchements, ses reproches, ses crises de nerfs, ses menaces de suicide... au téléphone.

En revanche, et par l'effet de cette spontanéité même, ses lettres sont un document psychologique du plus grand prix. La fougueuse châtelaine de Coppet s'y révèle tout entière; pour la première fois, je le répète, on a l'impression de posséder des données sûres et directes sur les ressorts qui l'agitent et la nature de ses rapports humains. Et d'abord, il va de soi, sur ses rapports avec le sexe opposé. A-t-on assez disserté de Mme de Staël et de l'amour! Quiconque reprendra ce sujet se devra de constater qu'elle est, en ces matières, beaucoup plus proche de la norme, j'allais dire de l'honnête moyenne, qu'on ne suppose généralement. Le nombre et le fracas de ses liaisons ne sauraient plus nous dissimuler les constantes de son tempérament: constantes ignorées d'elle, car la naïveté de cette femme de génie est sans limites dans l'ordre passionnel; constantes ignorées de ses amants, jusqu'au jour où ils se lassent d'elle et s'efforcent, avec un succès variable, de secouer leurs chaînes; mais constantes qui crèvent les yeux du lecteur non prévenu. Ceux qu'elle a véritablement aimés, ceux qui l'ont prise au piège du cœur et des sens—et l'on conçoit bien que la formule exclut Benjamin Constant—ceux-là étaient de beaux jeunes hommes: Narbonne et Ribbing en attendant O'Donnel et Rocca; des hommes en qui elle recherchait, et recherchera de plus en plus, jusqu'à s'accommoder de la fadeur de quelques-uns, les qualités de séduction physique qui lui manquaient. Des hommes, au surplus, qu'elle pût entourer d'une sollicitude impérieusement maternelle: des hommes à couvrir, à soigner, à protéger, à conseiller, à guider, à sauver d'eux-mêmes ou des griffes de l'adversité—ce qui supposait chez elle, outre la vocation du sacrifice, le sentiment d'une vaste supériorité dans le domaine de l'expérience et de l'esprit. Benjamin encore excepté, et Napoléon, bien entendu, elle n'a jamais rencontré d'intellect viril qui la dominât. Certainement point celui de son père: Necker, envers qui on lui prêtait une idolâtrie d'essence quasi freudienne, sort de cette correspondance singulièrement déprécié et déchu. Quant aux amants de son libre choix, elle veilla d'instinct

à ce que leur quotient d'intelligence, pour remarquable qu'il fût souvent, se situât peu ou prou au-dessous du sien; ou, si l'on préfère, elle exigea à tout le moins (prétention bien féminine) qu'ils en déferassent à ses qualités d'intuition: sous le prétexte ingénu qu'un caractère authentiquement mâle est empreint de délicatesse, et, de ce fait, épargne toutes les peines "à la femme la plus sensible, c'est-à-dire à celle qui devine tout dans la morale. . . ." Dans la morale, certes, et dans la politique aussi, et dans les affaires, et dans les moindres circonstances de la vie. D'où vient que Narbonne, disert et fin, mais qui, au bout du compte, n'était pas un aigle; que Ribbing, de fibre autrement vigoureuse, mais sans génie non plus, ouvrent la longue procession des personnages soi-disant exemplaires auxquels Germaine trouvait assez d'étoffe pour mériter ses soins . . . et lui jurer obéissance. Il arriva, comme il devait arriver, que l'un et l'autre s'affranchirent de sa tutelle, de manière passablement tortueuse dans le cas de Narbonne; et c'est bien là, répété par la suite avec de menues variantes, le drame de la vie amoureuse de Mme de Staël.

C'est aussi, la chose est claire, le drame des héroïnes qu'elles a créées à son image. Celui de Corinne, assurément; mais celui de Delphine tout aussi bien, dont Mme de Pange a parfaitement raison d'affirmer (préface à l'édition Solovieff) qu'il nous devient beaucoup plus vivant et explicable "depuis que nous connaissons les sentiments violents et souvent contradictoires que l'auteur venait d'éprouver." Et c'est en stricte justice également que Mme de Pange, élargissant le débat (préface à l'édition Balayé), remonte aux premiers essais littéraires de Germaine Necker pour y découvrir la préfiguration de l'amant idéal que Narbonne, Ribbing et leurs successeurs seront, bien futillement, sommés d'incarner. Le héros-chevalier qui hantait ses rêves de jeune fille, il est on ne peut plus vrai qu' "elle le poursuivra sans cesse de la fiction dans la réalité, puis, par un douloureux choc en retour, de la réalité dans la fiction." Le voilà bien, le mérite essentiel des lettres qu'on vient de nous livrer. Elles font entrer la vie et l'œuvre dans un circuit fermé; et puisque ce sont, au demeurant, des lettres des années sombres, où la politique emboîte le pas à l'amour; où tantôt elle l'exalte et tantôt le contrarie; où la révolution, la persécution, l'exil, la guerre civile et étrangère l'entourent d'une atmosphère de géhenne, l'on est fondé à penser et à dire que tous les motifs futurs de l'inspiration de Mme de Staël s'y trouvent déjà rigoureusement impliqués. (JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ, *Columbia University*)

The Literary Culture of Napoleon. By F. G. Healey. Geneva: Droz, and Paris: Minard, 1959. Pp. 172. Despite an enormous, and indeed overwhelming literature about him, Napoleon Bonaparte remains an elusive figure. He did too many things, expressed too many opinions to be easily reduced to a consistent and manageable personality. In this useful monograph, F. G. Healey clarifies a relatively neglected aspect of Napoleon's mind, "the action of literature upon Napoleon, its part in forming his personality, his views and his tastes, in short his literary culture" (p. 11). Especially in the early sections, Healey leans heavily on Arthur Chuquet's *La Jeunesse de Napoléon*, and Frédéric Masson's *Napoléon dans sa jeunesse*, two thorough works, but he deftly summarizes

their findings and uses them to offer a balanced, sensible portrait of Napoleon as reader.

The first, briefer part of Healey's book is devoted to an examination of Napoleon's education from his school days to the mid-1790's, when he was General Bonaparte. Healey concludes that the classical schooling Napoleon received at the military school in Brienne was mediocre, far less thorough and far less intelligent than the training an earlier generation received at the hands of the Jesuits. At the same time, Napoleon was introduced to the giants of seventeenth-century French literature, who remained abiding favorites: "whatever Napoleon's natural inclinations in literature, he underwent a competent indoctrination in the taste of the times and in particular in the French classical theatre, before his school days ended" (p. 24).

The revolution found him a young officer with much time on his hands, for all his early Corsican patriotism and later Jacobinism. He used it for an intensive program of reading, dictated partly by the exciting events in France, partly by the omissions in his formal education. He was much like other young men, a radical, an admirer of science, and an Anglomaniac. What was different was his Corsican origin, his intensity, and his energy. Hence he studied, with typical Napoleonic vigor, "the history of Corsica . . . history in general . . . the ideas of the 'philosophical' writers, of Rousseau, Raynal, and the Voltaire of the *Essai sur les mœurs*" (p. 31). Rousseau, indeed, was an early enthusiasm, but by the early 1790's, Napoleon's own writings reveal a distinct shift: "the Napoleon of the *Codes* and of the balanced budgets is beginning to appear, Napoleon, the administrator, to whom metaphysicians, *philosophes*, and 'ideologues' were anathema" (p. 38).

By the time he was a general, late in 1793, his literary tastes were formed, and it was becoming evident that he was too political, too pragmatic, and too egocentric to judge literature on literary grounds alone. He read what could advance specific projects, and judged what he read by a mixture of rigid literary canons, sentimental private notions, and (above all) political criteria. While he was leading the expedition to Egypt, he still had time to read *Werther* and to prefer Ossian to Homer, but literature for its own sake was receding before the imperative demands of policy.

It is this later, less attractive Napoleon, who occupies the larger, second part of Healey's study. When the claims of power conflicted with the claims of intellect, it was intellect, not power, that gave way. As Healey points out, Napoleon was hardly a believer, but as Consul and later as Emperor he sought a *rapprochement* with Rome and with Catholic opinion in France. Hence the surviving *philosophes* and the prominent *idéologues*, who actually expressed Napoleon's religious position, had to be silenced by intimidation or by rewards. Similarly, Napoleon's passion for the theatre gave way to the need for censoring "subversive" plays and even subversive lines in classic and wholly unpolitical tragedies.

Not all was policy, however. Healey cites several instances of a more relaxed Napoleon, a "connoisseur, critic and theorist of tragedy" (p. 88), a persistent admirer of the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, and a severe and even petulant critic of Chateaubriand and Madame de Staël. What emerges from Healey's judicious

pages, then, is a widely read, well informed and thoroughly conventional politician, a clever man whose literary judgment was tainted by power. It is useful to have such an estimate, backed as it is by detailed lists of Napoleon's reading, numerous quotations from his magisterial pronouncements, and interesting extracts from the opinions of others: it helps us to escape from the all-too-simple comparisons that have hindered, rather than advanced, our understanding of the man. All too often, Napoleon has been seen as a *philosophe* in action, or, conversely, as an early version of a twentieth-century totalitarian. He was neither: he was too dictatorial to be the former, and too civilized to be the latter. He was complicated, demanding a complicated judgment, and he was unique. (PETER GAY, *Columbia University*)

The Pessimism of Leconte de Lisle: The Work and the Time. By Irving Putter. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 42, no. 2). Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961. Pp. 145-408. In this volume, Professor Putter continues and brings to a triumphant conclusion the work already begun in 1954 on the pessimism of Leconte de Lisle. In the first volume, characterized in the *Romanic Review* by Professor Hunt as "scrupulous, lucid, and judicious," he found the source of the poet's pessimism in his "somber and unbending" character which was nevertheless devoted to the "loftiest ideals of humanity." In the present production, Mr. Putter has analyzed the major aspects of Leconte de Lisle's pessimism as revealed in his written work and related it to the thought of the mid-nineteenth century.

The volume is organized into three main chapters: I. The Metaphysical Problem, II. The Nature of Life, III. The Poet and Society. Some might argue that the last should be first, that the poet's condemnation of the materialistic society of his day underlies and buttresses all the abstractions of the first two chapters, but I think that Mr. Putter's arrangement is not only his privilege, but is, on the whole, satisfactory.

The first chapter rests on the thesis that Leconte de Lisle thirsted for an absolute, that he desperately sought a positive faith, that his pessimism results from his failure to find one. He lived in an age of criticism in which all religions were subjected to scrutiny. Men came to the conclusion that there was good and bad in most. This tolerance, born of criticism, was a deadly dissolvent leading to negation, to doubt, and to ignorance. Mr. Putter says correctly that the most intense poetic expression of this nineteenth century phenomenon was given by Leconte de Lisle. "In him idealism yearning for the absolute collides with the philosophical relativism which radically undermines it." In the case of Christianity, it did more, for the poet was not only convinced that this religion was no more of an absolute ideal than the others, but, angered by the views and activities of conservative Catholics, he became violently hostile to Christianity which he characterized as a religion of anguish, constraint, repression, and intolerance. Mr. Putter is inclined to think that the poet's violence is sometimes detrimental to his art. He is probably right, though one might question whether strong feeling is incompatible with art.

The second chapter on the "Nature of Life" postulates that Leconte de

Lisle's disappointment with life stems from a "strong appreciation of and need for beauty, love, strength, freedom, and joy." These, if achieved at all in this life, are ephemeral. There is no permanence. Mr. Putter quotes appropriately from a letter written by the poet to Louise Colet: "Voilà la misère la plus affreuse, savoir qu'on bâtit sur du sable ou sur de la vase et qu'on ne peut bâtir ailleurs, et que tout s'écroule à mesure." This conviction leads to the further conclusion that the only reality is Death—not death in the Christian sense, of course, but annihilation. Indeed, the poet was enough of a kindred spirit to the Hindus to maintain that all is illusion: "Et le néant final des êtres et des choses / Est l'unique raison de leur réalité." Was Leconte de Lisle sincere in this? Some scholars have questioned his belief. But Mr. Putter is convinced of its genuineness, and he makes out a good case in support of his view (pp. 281-87).

But life, for Leconte de Lisle, is more than illusory, it is also a positive evil. Suffering and cruelty are necessary and inherent conditions of existence, and not merely for men alone: "Tout gémit, l'astre pleure et le mont se lamente, / Un soupir douloureux s'exhale des forêts" (*Qaïn*); "La faim sacrée est un long meurtre légitime" (*Sacra fames*). The notion of universal suffering was confirmed to Leconte de Lisle by his reading of Indian philosophy, that of cruelty by the Darwinian concept of the struggle for life. Does man revolt against this state of affairs? Yes, indeed, but without success. The ultimate solution can be nothing but annihilation. Here, too, Mr. Putter makes out a good case for this uncompromisingly desperate conclusion.

Mr. Putter's third chapter is briefer and needs little comment. That most of the great writers of the period felt themselves at odds with society is perfectly clear. Flaubert, Baudelaire, Maupassant, the Goncourts, Heredia all shared this attitude. Leconte de Lisle but reflects a widespread view when he says that "les vrais poètes sont les bêtes noires de l'humanité." To those who wished to seek their inspiration in contemporary events, in mechanical progress, he turned a deaf ear. The wedding of poetry and industry, proposed by Maxime Du Camp, he dubbed monstrous. Such proposals merely confirmed his pessimism. Art, true art, is the only solace, the only faith that does not betray. It must not be prostituted.

I have said enough to indicate how highly I regard Mr. Putter's work. My only reservation might be that here and there he has not distinguished between pessimism, which is a state of mind, "un état d'esprit," and melancholy, which is a mood, "un état d'âme," not that a pessimist cannot be melancholy or a melancholy fellow have an intellectual basis for his emotion. But there is, I think, a valid distinction which needs to be kept in mind. In general, however, Mr. Putter's judgments are sound. He has made an extraordinarily thorough analysis of Leconte de Lisle's poetry, and he has done it with intelligence, insight, and sensitivity. He is to be congratulated on a fine performance.¹ (ELLIOTT M. GRANT, *Williams College*)

1. I have noted only a few misprints: p. 189, Châtres; p. 197, le Terre; p. 198, *Le Paix*; p. 363, Usually; p. 387, materiaist. Throughout I was a little bothered by seeing æ (in such words as *œuvre*) printed as two separate letters instead of in ligature.

The Life and Works of Jean Richepin. By Howard Sutton. Genève: Droz and Paris: Minard, 1961. Pp. 316. There have been few instances in literary history of greater vicissitudes in the reputation of an author than in the case of Jean Richepin. Little read or played today, this poet, dramatist and novelist occupied a position of prominence in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth which, without Dr. Sutton's brilliant and scholarly work to remind us, would seem almost incredible today.

Since the amazing career of Richepin began with his imprisonment for flaunting conventional morals by his glorification of beggars, prostitutes and other outcasts of society and ended half a century later in the odor of sanctity with his confirmation as a member of the respected Académie Française and lecturer to fashionable young ladies at the Université des Annales, the reader might have preferred to have Dr. Sutton mingle his biographical material with the literary development of his author. Since, however, he has chosen to treat the various aspects of Richepin's production separately under the heading of Poems, Plays, Novels and Short Stories, and Miscellaneous Works, it was entirely logical to give us first a complete biography. In doing this Professor Sutton has not only brought to life an extraordinarily fascinating and controversial individual, but has also succeeded admirably in relating him to the principal literary movements and personalities of his time.

The task must have been an arduous one. To analyze Richepin's enormous production of seventy-three separate works in their various genres, many of which require the patience and fortitude of Job, demanded an abnegation and a devotion to scholarship of the highest order. A closely packed bibliography covering seventeen pages, listing every work of Richepin and every critical article which has appeared on him, gives ample evidence of the thoroughness with which this investigation was conducted; this was supplemented moreover by interviews with Richepin's surviving son. Until this book appeared, only one extensive survey of Richepin had appeared in French and none in English, so that Dr. Sutton is really breaking fresh ground. In his foreword he states that his ambition has been "to harvest the field so thoroughly that it will be unnecessary for gleaners to follow." It is unlikely that any will dare to do so, for this study will surely rank as the authoritative work on Richepin and as such will be indispensable for every college library.

Among the eleven volumes of Richepin's poetry, Dr. Sutton finds only the first, *La Chanson des gueux*, worthy to survive. Summing up the various influences that Richepin underwent, Dr. Sutton states: "He combined the emotionalism of the Romantics, the preoccupation with form of the Parnassians, and the earthiness of the Naturalists, whose counterpart in poetry he at first seemed to be."

It is obvious that Dr. Sutton considers Richepin's dramas the least enduring of his three genres, and of these only two, *Le Chemineau* and *Le Flibustier*, possess any attraction for the present day. The critic in his endeavor to mitigate his amply justified harshness towards Richepin's theater, can only damn the former with this faint praise: "Performed as a period piece, it might still reveal a faded and nostalgic charm, at the same time that it would bear witness to the tastes, the ideals and the illusions of the public of 1897." Of the latter's hardy survival this reviewer can give as evidence the fact that he saw

it still being performed by a traveling stock company in the public square of Manosque during the summer of 1960.

On the whole it would seem that Dr. Sutton finds Richépin's fiction the most attractive portion of his work, feeling that with a surer critical sense and the capacity for self-discipline he might have achieved the rank of Barbey d'Aurevilly or Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, whom he resembles somewhat. Though most of his ten novels and nine volumes of short stories and novellas are unreadable today because of their abuse of rhetoric and mystification, Dr. Sutton thinks it possible that three of the best at least, *Braves Gens*, *Césarine*, and *Le Cadet* "are more viable than the poems and plays on which his reputation was largely based during his lifetime."

One finds little to criticize in this judicious and well-documented survey. The critic has indeed managed "to avoid the extremes of adulation and denigration" and if at times he comes closer to the latter than the former, this is no doubt due to the weariness of spirit that much of Richépin's output must have caused him. This weariness, however, is not transmitted to the reader, for Dr. Sutton's work, despite its accuracy of detail and breadth of documentation, makes delightful reading. The richness of his vocabulary, the clarity and balance of his judgment, and the frequent flashes of dry humor and irony—as for instance in his fascinating chapter on the relations between Richépin and Sarah Bernhardt—make this book a model for future writers of dissertations. (MAXWELL A. SMITH, *University of Chattanooga*)

Maurice Maeterlinck: A Study of His Life and Thought. By W. D. Halls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960. Pp. 189. W. D. Halls has called his book on Maurice Maeterlinck "A Study of His Life and Thought." On reading this volume, however, one becomes aware that his choice of title is not particularly apt. Mr. Halls has, in fact, written an interesting biography of the Belgian Nobel Prize winner, but he does not delve at all deeply into his thought, and one can hardly turn to the present work for serious literary criticism on Maeterlinck. The very arrangement—it proceeds chronologically—does not lend itself to the critical approach.

Mr. Halls *does* discuss Maeterlinck's works briefly and relates his thoughts and preoccupations. But these all too brief and superficial discussions, especially of the plays, are lacking in critical insight and in a point of view. For instance, one is surprised to read in the Conclusion that Maeterlinck failed in his quest and that "in the field of creative literature, for a French public he lost all significance as early as 1913." One is surprised not because one disagrees with this harsh but undeniably accurate statement, but because one is totally unprepared for it. In the main body of the text, Mr. Halls considers the individual works mostly with regard to the circumstances in which they were written and produced; only rarely does one find a judgment or even an evaluation. Thus, for example, we are told many anecdotes surrounding the composition and staging of *L'Oiseau bleu*, but only two paragraphs are devoted to the play itself: in the first, the main ideas of this fairy tale are simply delineated, and in the second, the author links the work to Maeterlinck's prevailing pessimism. Beyond that, there is nothing!

But if this book has very serious shortcomings as a study of the Belgian's

work, it has considerable merit as a study of his life. Mr. Halls bases himself largely on unpublished correspondence and on interviews with Countess Maeterlinck, the playwright's widow. This material, together with previously known aspects of his life, creates a detailed account of Maeterlinck's largely troubled eighty-seven years of existence. Mr. Halls succeeds in depicting the multi-faceted personality of this energetic yet incredibly timid man who ranked as one of the leading literary lights in pre-World War I Europe. The biographer fortunately does not fall into the trap of seeing his subject through distorted glasses that let only praiseworthy things pass. Mr. Halls' Maeterlinck is a man whose personal virtues are tempered fortunately by human shortcomings.

After a somewhat involved examination of the Maeterlinck family tree, the author retraces his subject's boyhood in Flanders and begins to study his paradoxical relationship to his native country. Repulsed by the materialism and reactionary politics of contemporary Belgium, he early longed for the freedom of Paris and, after several lengthy visits, he finally settled in the French capital in 1897. Yet, much as he continued to scorn Belgium, most of his plays, even in his last years, were set in Flanders. Only during the two world wars did his pen come to the aid of his countrymen—he became then a vigorous, anti-German Belgian nationalist and earned the gratitude of his government. Having long criticized the right-wing Catholic government in Belgium, one might expect him to have been pleased when the prevailing current in the kingdom swung to the left in the nineteen twenties; curiously, he himself had veered towards the *Action Française* in the interim and was as dissatisfied as ever.

The most fascinating aspects of Maeterlinck's life, and of this book, were his relations to the two women who, successively, were his companions over the course of half a century. For twenty-three years, Maeterlinck's existence was shared—often against his will, Mr. Halls feels—by the actress Georgette Leblanc, whom the Hearst papers once called "The Woman who Fed the Fires of Poet Maeterlinck's Genius." This was a turbulent relationship which, from the playwright's point of view, was more successful artistically than emotionally. For Georgette Leblanc's strong, domineering personality became the prototype of the *femmes fortes* that peopled the dramatist's works during that period, but it was a personality that, as a man, he found often stifling. The couple moved in the most eminent artistic circles of the Continent and shared numerous great moments together with the more vexing facets of their liaison. As an example of the latter, it is sufficient to mention that Georgette Leblanc caused the permanent rupture between Debussy and Maeterlinck when the composer refused to let her sing *Mélisande*.

In 1919, the Belgian married Renée Dahon (who was also an actress) and spent his last twenty-eight years with her. If this period seems less tempestuous in Mr. Halls' book than the Georgette Leblanc era, it is undoubtedly in part because Mme Maeterlinck was a less flamboyant person and because the writer himself was entering old age. But in part too, the restraint can probably be attributed to the fact that the factual information for these chapters stems perforce directly from the playwright's widow.

Interesting, too, are Mr. Halls' pages dealing with Maeterlinck's two trips to the United States—once, in 1920, for a lecture tour followed by an unsuccessful

ful attempt at script writing in Hollywood, and then as a refugee during the second World War. The biographer recreates well the atmosphere of the literary exiles in New York and an old man's attempts to cope with a world he could simply not fathom. Occasionally, Mr. Halls is a bit indulgent with Maeterlinck. Thus he writes that he "had to attend" meetings and receptions (at which he was being honored) against his will, and that he was "forced to go south to Palm Beach" to escape the rigors of a northern winter.

Mr. Halls brings out that in his later years, Maeterlinck was often taken up with philosophical speculations about life, death, the after-life and similar matters. These turned out to be superficial investigations which "failed to penetrate the mysteries of Destiny and Death" and by means of which "he did not discover the universal secret of wisdom and truth." The pretention and futility of this philosophical bent confirm the fact that Maeterlinck's significance for the world of letters was almost totally spent by 1913, and that, to paraphrase Mr. Halls, nothing damaged his literary renown so much as the fact that he lived so long.

This book, then, is not a critical study, but a biography which sheds much light—some of it new—on the life of Belgium's best known author. In this respect, it is a worthwhile addition. Mr. Halls has appended a long and valuable bibliography. (THOMAS BISHOP, *New York University*)

Colette. By Elaine Marks. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1960. Pp. 259. In Miss Marks' opening chapter, deftly called "Why Colette?" she makes it very clear that in spite of the many honors heaped on Colette during her lifetime and the flurry of *hommages à Colette* brought about by her death, there has been little attempt to appraise her work systematically. The reasons for this state of critical neglect are apparent to the readers of Colette. Her works (fifteen volumes in the Flammarion edition) are extremely varied, long, and uneven in quality. And the legend of Colette—her life with Willy, her Bohemianism, music-hall days, scandals, etc.—constantly imposes itself so that the tasks of biographer and critic become enormously confused in the mingling of life and literature. In her study, Miss Marks, with many cautionary remarks to her readers, tackles both the legendary life and the works.

Her attempt to portray an objective Colette is the least successful aspect of her book. For the final picture of a Colette of healthy appetites, absorbed in a battle for personal liberty, morally preoccupied, obsessed by nature and naturalness, is largely accomplished by reading into Colette's life those elements that constitute the essence of her work. Relying heavily on *Mes Apprentissages*, *Sido*, and *La Maison de Claudine*, much of Miss Marks' image of Colette comes out of a hypothetical juxtaposition of Sidonie (Colette's mother) as all good to an all evil Willy. Miss Marks is very much aware of the difficult problem of the relationship of person to author, of author to narrator, and through a complicated scheme of names (borrowed from Colette's use of "Sido") she seeks to overcome it. But as the Colettes multiply (Colette, "Colette," "Sido," Sido, Colette-Sido, Colette-Claudine, etc.) the reader is forced into the uncomfortable, annoying position of constantly having to trace the particular Colette he is dealing with at the moment. Colette's fundamental theme, her unique

literary creation is Colette or, as Miss Marks prefers, "Colette." How much of her actual life is transposed, reflected or re-created in the creation of Colette is impossible to know. In this respect the Colette of *Claudine à l'école* is as authentic as that of *La Naissance du jour* or *Le Fanal bleu*. If the reader can ignore this aspect of Miss Marks' study, he will be richly rewarded by what is surely the most intelligent and sensitive analysis available of Colette's works.

At the heart of Miss Marks' *Colette* is the idea of "Regarde." It is an active process of perception of the world, of acceptance of the world, of being in the world. For Colette the world contains both a moral and esthetic imperative. Morally, "Regarde" implies acceptance of all experience for its own sake, of the inevitable, so that momentary happiness and ultimate wisdom may be created in life. Experience or action always involves, for Colette, loss and pain and suffering. For those who survive there is, however, a positive gain in lucidity. It is not through love, an accepted route to happiness, that equilibrium is attained, but through one's relationship to and respect for the infinite richness and variety of nature, of life itself. In refusing to accept *a priori* metaphysical and moral systems, Colette gives herself entirely to life and is thus enabled to see its wonder, purity, and unity. No intellectual, moral, or even biological hierarchies exist in Colette; there is only the oneness of life. For her, individuals achieve stature by their expression of purity.

The notion of purity is the goal of the spiritual journey of *La Naissance du jour*; it is subsequently explored in *Le Pur et l'impur*. In these two great meditative works Colette seems to define purity as a privileged state of independence, of absolute commitment to a governing emotion. Léa, Chéri, Pépé and Sido are pure; Colette did not consider herself so, but Miss Marks points out that the purity of Colette's art would include her in this rare group. There is a close connection in Colette between the idea of purity and the esthetic imperative of "Regarde."

Esthetically, "Regarde" is inherent in the extreme realism that marks Colette's work. Just as she rejected metaphysical and moral systems, so in her art she refuses to indulge in intellectual abstractions and symbolism. Her attention before present sensations and past memories, her love of color, light, texture, and flesh result in the sensuous lyricism that is the *griffe* of Colette. From the early *Claudine* novels to a final dissection of the "masterpieces," *La Maison de Claudine*, *Sido*, *La Naissance du jour*, Miss Marks ingeniously shows the unity in Colette's work. The themes of the purity of childhood, the awakening to adolescence, the game of love, the morally curative powers of nature appear throughout. There is also a dramatic unity: the suffering and grandeur of love, the stifling, closed settings of the novels and other pieces, the use of dialogue, gesture, action, detail which reveal the character, are all suggestive of the inevitability in Racine's tragedies. Over all, however, is the ever-present Colette whose meticulous style reveals her oneness with all of life.

Miss Marks has made an extraordinary contribution in making the unity and purity of Colette's works apparent. It is to be hoped that she will bring to a biography of Colette, before the fifty-year lapse she assumes necessary, all of her organizational talent, insight, and enthusiasm. (ALVIN LABAT, *Harvard University*)

Marcel Arland, Benjamin Crémieux, Ramon Fernandez: *Trois Critiques de la Nouvelle Revue Française*. Par A. Eustis. Paris: Nouvelles Editions Debresse, 1961. Pp. 222. En un temps que M. Eustis caractérise comme "de confusion et de piétinement," la *Nouvelle Revue Française*, proclamant la nécessité d'une refonte des valeurs, formula les exigences d'un "classicisme moderne." Mais il ressort qu'aux yeux mêmes des fondateurs de la revue, ce sont les critiques plutôt que les auteurs par elle publiés qui manifestent ses tendances profondes. Or, parmi ces critiques, Benda par son intellectualisme fanatique, Suarez et du Bos par leur exaltation lyrique, Thibaudet par son "bergsonisme intégral" et son "style touffu de poète symboliste" occupent une place à part. Quant à Jacques Rivière, son esprit positiviste demeura fermé aux inquiétudes de la génération d'après-guerre. "Répondre à toutes les questions que Rivière a dû laisser sans réponse, ce sera la tâche des trois critiques, dont deux recrutés par Rivière, qui font l'objet de cette étude." Ayant ainsi dégagé leur caractère représentatif, M. Eustis nous présente successivement "Marcel Arland ou le critique moraliste," "Benjamin Crémieux ou le critique érudit," "Ramon Fernandez ou le critique philosophe."

Ame pascalienne profondément marquée par une crise religieuse d'adolescence, Marcel Arland, dans son retentissant article de février 1924 "Sur un nouveau mal du siècle," n'hésita pas à proclamer: "Je ne conçois pas de littérature sans éthique." Toutefois, ce "moraliste" dénonce, dans la conception sartrienne de l'engagement, une contamination de l'art par l'idéologie. Transcendant l'immédiate transcription de l'expérience vécue, mais libre de tout didactisme idéologique, l'œuvre authentique, pour Arland, se manifeste comme *quête*, apparaît, par rapport à l'auteur, comme lieu et moyen d'une création de soi par soi. Entre l'auteur comme homme et l'œuvre objectivement considérée se définit ainsi une troisième entité: la *figure*, notion qui permet à Marcel Arland, selon M. Eustis, "d'intérioriser l'ancienne critique biographique (qui restait trop souvent sans prise sur l'œuvre), tout en évitant une critique purement formelle."

Au fondement de la critique de Benjamin Crémieux (italianisant de grande classe qui révéla Pirandello au public français), M. Eustis décèle une "méthode génétique": cette méthode consiste à définir, à partir d'écrits intimes ou de passages révélateurs, la personnalité profonde de l'écrivain et l'aspect que revêt chez lui le "mécanisme de la création," puis à juger les œuvres d'après le degré de convenance réciproque de trois facteurs: les dons propres de l'auteur, les exigences intrinsèques du sujet, celles du genre choisi. Au nom du "classicisme moderne," Crémieux d'une part rejette, aussi bien que le naturalisme, tous mouvements extrémistes d'avant-garde, d'autre part propose une synthèse des valeurs méditerranéennes alliant "à la raison lumineuse de l'héritage gréco-latin, la joie de vivre nègre, la sagesse musulmane et l'avidité juive."

Cohérence et clarté, reconnaît M. Eustis, ne furent point les qualités maîtresses de Ramon Fernandez. Mais ce curieux esprit, admirateur de Newman, Meredith et T. S. Eliot aussi bien que de Léon Brunschvicg, abonde en vues originales et fécondes, témoin son interprétation du réalisme balzacien ou sa célèbre analyse des caractéristiques distinctives du récit et du roman. Nulle psychologie valable ne saurait, pour Fernandez, faire abstraction de l'éthique,

la conscience des réalités morales étant elle-même un "fait" psychologique: en réduisant l'homme au dualisme de l'intelligence et de la sensation, l'amoralisme proustien manque le centre vivant de la personnalité. Par sa philosophie centrée sur les catégories d'action, de liberté, de responsabilité, par sa critique du déterminisme freudien, Fernandez annonce Sartre: pour lui, comme pour Sartre, l'homme est fondamentalement *projet*.

En son chapitre de conclusion, M. Eustis souligne cette qualité de précurseurs qu'Arland et Crémieux partagent à ses yeux avec Fernandez. Sartre, note-t-il, s'est montré, à l'égard du mouvement de la *N.R.F.*, "un enfant ingrat": car "la critique française ne l'a pas attendu pour protester contre les valeurs de Gide et de Proust, ni pour mettre la morale au cœur de l'esthétique en attaquant l'art pour l'art et le réalisme." Mais grâce à leur conception plus large, plus "humaniste" de l'engagement, les trois critiques ont su mieux concilier que les existentialistes l'acte de présence au monde et l'autonomie de l'œuvre d'art. L'exemple de ces précurseurs reste donc à méditer.

En plus de l'œuvre critique d'Arland, Crémieux et Fernandez, œuvre fort riche dont nous n'avons fait ici qu'indiquer quelques thèmes, M. Eustis étudie leur œuvre romanesque et, lorsqu'il y a lieu, leur position politique. Synthèse élégante et approfondie, l'ouvrage de M. Eustis nous paraît apporter une contribution de valeur à l'histoire de la pensée française contemporaine. (LOUIS PAMPLUME, *Vassar College*)

Das Wagnis des französischen Gegenwartromans. Die neue Welterfahrung in der Literatur. Von Gerda Zeltner-Neukomm. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1960. Pp. 169. Comme le titre l'indique ("das Wagnis"), c'est l'aspect "tentative" du roman français contemporain qui a retenu Mme Zeltner-Neukomm. Tous les romanciers qui, à des titres divers, continuent la tradition (tels Mauriac, Martin du Gard, Françoise Sagan) sont ignorés dans cette étude consacrée au premier chef à Malraux, Sartre, Camus, Robbe-Grillet, Butor, Nathalie Sarraute, Queneau et quelques autres, dont la célébrité est moins bruyante: Pierre Gascar, André Pieyre de Mandiargues et Maurice Blanchot. Cette liste suffit à montrer que Madame Zeltner-Neukomm entend faire remonter assez loin dans le passé le phénomène de fermentation littéraire que l'étiquette de "nouveau roman" tend à limiter aux dix dernières années. Ce n'est donc ni une génération ni une école que le critique helvétique tente d'isoler, mais une famille d'écrivains que réunit la même volonté de renouveler le genre romanesque.

L'ouvrage tient le milieu entre un essai et un manuel. Du premier genre il a la limitation du point de vue défini dans la préface, le choix subjectif—de l'aveu même du critique—opéré parmi les écrivains à considérer, l'originalité des aperçus. L'auteur ne vise pas à tout dire, mais il va loin et ses commentaires méritent d'être relus et médités. Les textes ont été lus de très près et de larges extraits en sont cités en traduction allemande, sauf quand la langue présente une originalité telle qu'une transposition se révèle impossible, comme dans le cas des *Exercices de style* de Queneau, dont un échantillon nous est donné dans l'original. Les commentaires ne survolent pas le texte; ils s'attachent au détail avec une exactitude qui comblera l'amateur d'"explications." On

en donnera pour exemple la phrase initiale de *Week-end à Zuydcoote* de Robert Merle, dans laquelle Mme Zeltner-Neukomm s'attache à dégager d'un simple adverbe tout un aspect du roman moderne (pp. 28 et 29). On admirera également l'instructive comparaison établie entre une phrase de *La Nausée* et des *Abeilles d'Aristée* de Wladimir Weidlé (pp. 46-48).

Das Wagnis n'est pas seulement un essai; c'est également un manuel. Tout y est parfaitement étiqueté, daté, résumé et classé, sans que le critique tombe dans le défaut dont souffrent bien des ouvrages traitant de littérature contemporaine: que de fois on nous propose une grille de classement où le moindre titre trouve sa place grâce à deux épithètes et un -isme quelconque! Mme Zeltner-Neukomm aime l'ordre; elle ne reste pas pour autant prisonnière de ses catégories. Le lecteur qui voudra lui emprunter des lumières sur Robbe-Grillet ne se contentera pas de lire le chapitre expressément consacré à l'auteur du *Voyeur*. Il devra recourir à l'index qui renvoie à plusieurs sections de l'ouvrage. Il est peut-être dommage que le relevé des passages se rapportant à un auteur ait été fait sur une base purement onomastique: ainsi l'allusion à *L'Etranger* et à son "moi pétrifié" ne fait pas l'objet d'une mention dans l'index, apparemment parce que le nom de Camus ne figure pas dans le passage en question.

Mme Zeltner-Neukomm dégage de l'écheveau complexe de la littérature contemporaine les mille et une traditions, influences et similitudes qui permettent d'introduire dans le chaos de la vie l'ordre de l'intelligence. Bien des jalons sont posés qui serviront de guide à l'historien futur. Nous voyons comment Jules Renard anticipe sur le traitement de l'homme "atomisé" chez les romanciers qui le suivent; nous assistons au passage de la nausée de Roquentin face aux choses à la vision de Robbe-Grillet, lequel replace les objets dans une véritable relation avec l'homme; nous décelons le rapport d'imitation ironique qui règne entre les thèmes et les formes de certains romans contemporains et ceux des romans classiques: *La Modification* et *La Jalousie* reprennent consciemment le motif du triangle, qui est le plus éculé de la tradition, et si *L'Etranger* est un roman-je, c'est par souci de parodie, le romancier moderne entendant précisément tourner le dos à cette forme de narration. On appréciera également les parallèles que le critique excelle à développer entre le roman et le cinéma (les films néo-réalistes italiens offrant par exemple des réalisations comparables à certaines œuvres littéraires), entre le "roman pur" et la "poésie pure" (le récit-message faisant place au récit-objet, un peu comme ces vers de Valéry qui "nous apprennent qu'ils n'ont rien à nous apprendre"); enfin on goûtera les remarques sur les rapports entre les recherches d'un Maurice Blanchot et celles des peintres abstraits.

Malheureusement l'information historique de Mme Zeltner-Neukomm n'est pas toujours de même aloi que sa sensibilité littéraire. Quand elle parle de Stendhal, Flaubert et Balzac, c'est pour dénoncer l'action inhibitrice que le prestige de ce trio a exercée sur les romanciers qui ont suivi. La chose n'est pas niable, mais n'aurait-il pas fallu montrer également comment les trois grands créateurs ont amorcé un mouvement qui a abouti à la disparition du romancier omniscient et au divorce entre le roman et le genre épique? Hans-

Robert Jauss avait fort bien mis ce fait en lumière dès 1955; il ne semble pas que notre critique ait eu son ouvrage sous les yeux.

Madame Zeltner-Neukomm ignore également les recherches de W. M. Frohock, sinon elle n'affirmerait pas de façon aussi péremptoire que Malraux a joué un rôle comme agitateur communiste en Chine (pp. 31 et 156) et elle ne nous dirait pas que Malraux est le pseudonyme d'un écrivain dont le vrai nom est Berger.¹

Enfin j'aurais aimé voir une place plus grande faite à Dostoïevsky (signalé seulement pour le parallélisme entre le procès de Raskolnikof et celui de Meursault), et à Gobineau (dont *Les Pléiades* devançant de loin *Paludes* avec leur romancier à l'intérieur du roman), et surtout je regrette beaucoup l'oubli dont est victime Valéry Larbaud. Comment laisser de côté le praticien du monologue intérieur, qui faisait du "nouveau roman" vingt ans et plus avant la lettre? Comment passer sous silence ce que le héros de *La Modification* doit à Lucas Letheil installé dans un train italien et monologuant sur le thème de l'hésitation entre Isabelle et Irène?

Ne soyons pas injuste envers Mme Zeltner-Neukomm. Ses erreurs sont réparables et ne diminuent pas l'intérêt qu'un lecteur averti prendra à son ouvrage. Quant aux lacunes, n'oublions pas qu'il ne pouvait être question de tout dire dans un essai dont la longueur est limitée par la collection dans laquelle il s'insère. D'autre part était-il possible de retracer de façon à satisfaire tout le monde l'histoire d'une évolution dont certains des acteurs n'ont pas atteint la quarantaine? Estimons-nous heureux de posséder déjà le premier guide capable de nous frayer un chemin dans une région aussi vaste et d'accès aussi difficile.

Que la langue allemande ne décourage pas le lecteur. Le style est d'une clarté et d'une simplicité rares; aucun jargon n'alourdit l'exposé. Les imprimeurs et les correcteurs ont fait du bon travail. Je n'ai relevé que deux fautes d'impression: *dépaïsement* pour *dépaysement* (p. 34) et "Dich auch, wenn du nicht gewesen wärest, hätte die Stadt sich (pour *dich*) erfunden" (pp. 88-89). (MARCEL MULLER, *Lawrence College*)

The Intellectual Hero. By Victor Brombert. Philadelphia and New York: Lipincott, 1961. Pp. 225. "It is the purpose of this study to examine, within the precise context of representative works a climate of intellectual tension which, ever since the Dreyfus Affair . . . has oriented the novel toward a permanent questioning of the concept of Man, the meaning of History and the value of Civilization." C'est ainsi que dans l'introduction, l'auteur présente son livre. Il consacre d'abord un chapitre à définir "l'intellectuel," puis, dans une première partie, examine l'évolution littéraire du personnage de l'intellectuel à travers les œuvres de Vallès, Bourget, Zola et France, Martin du Gard, Louis Guilloux (un chapitre pour chacun) montrant comment s'impose peu à peu ce type de héros romanesque; enfin, dans une deuxième partie de quatre cha-

1. Le lecteur corrigera un autre élément de la légende qui entoure Malraux en se reportant à l'article d'André Vandegans "Malraux a-t-il fréquenté les grandes écoles?" *Revue des Langues vivantes*, XXVI (1960), n. 5, 336-40, qui répond par la négative. L'information de Mme Zeltner-Neukomm ne peut être mise en cause ici puisque cet article a paru en même temps que son livre.

pitres, il analyse l'impasse tragique à laquelle sont acculés les personnages de Malraux, de Sartre, et, d'une façon plus générale, tous les problèmes idéologiques soulevés pendant la période 1930-1960. Contrairement donc à ce que pourrait laisser supposer le titre: "The Intellectual Hero," nous n'avons pas seulement affaire à l'étude d'un type de héros romanesque. Le thème qu'a choisi Mr. Brombert est riche de multiples harmoniques, et, loin de le restreindre, il l'exploite à fond. L'ampleur des vues qu'il expose brillamment fait de son livre le modèle réduit d'une histoire des idées dans la première moitié du XX^e siècle.

En particulier les deux chapitres consacrés dans la dernière partie à 1930-50: *The Age of Guilt* et *The Fifties: the Anti-intellectual Reaction*, frappent par l'habileté avec laquelle l'auteur intègre son analyse littéraire et idéologique à une analyse quasi sociologique. Mr. Brombert a bien vu que seule une étude "culturelle" au sens le plus large du mot (celui "d'anthropologie culturelle") pourrait en fin de compte répondre de façon satisfaisante aux multiples questions que soulève son investigation. "The true importance and originality of the intellectual hero in the novel of ideas is that he appeared in the literary horizon at a time when the image of man in literature was constantly shrinking under the impact of psychological and sociological investigation." Déjà en 1925 Malraux écrivait: "l'homme est mort après Dieu"; pour lui, comme pour les écrivains de sa génération, le problème est de formuler une nouvelle notion de l'homme: héros qui transforme en conscience l'expérience la plus large possible, artiste qui triomphe des forces obscures de Saturne, "passion inutile," etc. . . . Dans une époque qui n'est qu'interrogation comment le roman ne serait-il pas envahi par cette interrogation? Mais cette interrogation encore faut-il l'expliquer. Tel n'est pas le but de l'auteur certes, mais la qualité de son livre nous fait souhaiter qu'un jour il s'attelle à une histoire culturelle du XX^e siècle.

Pour mener à bien cette étude il fallait d'abord définir le terme "intellectuel." Mr. Brombert remarque que dès qu'il est mis en circulation (1897-98) le terme "intellectuel" est péjoratif. Mais les gens qui l'appliquent péjorativement à leurs ennemis sont aussi des intellectuels si l'on donne au mot son vrai sens large ("tout homme dont une idée engage et ordonne la vie" selon Malraux). C'est que le concept se développe à un moment de crise politique, sociale, morale, et reste lié à cette idée de crise. Il implique même un état de crise permanente affirme l'auteur, et ce n'est certes pas la période contemporaine qui le contredit! Voilà qui aidera à comprendre pourquoi ce mot est toujours si chargé aujourd'hui de puissance passionnelle. D'autre part c'est cette tendance à la dénigration, à la caricature qui a permis le développement d'un type littéraire qui, du Vingtras père de Vallès au Mathieu de Sartre ne cessera de prendre de l'importance. Il faut donc bien se garder d'identifier complètement le "héros intellectuel," personnage romanesque, et "l'intellectuel de gauche" (ou de droite à supposer qu'il y en ait encore) personnage représentatif de la société contemporaine. Ce qu'ils ont en commun, l'auteur le définit en ces termes: "The vocation of moral responsibility, the specific role of witness and denouncer . . . places the intellectual at the very center of the historic current of his time. . . . His message is a permanent accusation." Voilà

qui explique à la fois l'importance de ce héros et les attaques dont il est l'objet: la société n'aime guère que ses écrivains lui donnent mauvaise conscience.

L'excellent livre de Mr. Brombert sera désormais indispensable à tous ceux qui s'intéressent à la littérature française. Son plus grand mérite est peut-être de nous rappeler que la critique littéraire la plus rigoureuse peut n'être pas écrite en jargon et atteindre, sans compromission aucune, le public cultivé mais non spécialisé. (JEAN CARDUNER, *University of Michigan*)

Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque. Par René Girard. Paris: Grasset, 1961. Pp. 312. Ce remarquable essai de M. Girard est destiné, je le crois, à prendre rang auprès de trois ou quatre œuvres critiques majeures apparues dans les lettres françaises depuis une trentaine d'années: *l'Amour et l'Occident*, de Denis de Rougemont, *l'Âme romantique et le Rêve*, d'Albert Béguin, les essais de Maurice Blanchot, les études de Georges Poulet sur le temps. Je ne veux pas dire que tout, dans le livre de René Girard, me convainc. Je ne veux même pas dire que sa pensée me paraisse assez claire toujours pour espérer convaincre. Je veux dire que ce livre, avec ses défauts, s'impose, d'emblée, comme une de ces œuvres qui renouvellent les perspectives critiques, et forcent le lecteur à remettre en question les interprétations traditionnelles. Ce n'est pas un mince éloge.

La thèse d'abord. M. René Girard part du choix de Don Quichotte. En décidant de vivre les valeurs romanesques telles que les lui fournissent, toutes faites, les récits de chevalerie, Don Quichotte adopte le désir d'autrui. "Don Quichotte a renoncé, en faveur d'Amadis, à la prérogative fondamentale de l'individu: il ne choisit plus les objets de son désir, c'est Amadis qui doit choisir pour lui." Amadis devient, selon la terminologie de Girard, le "médiateur" du désir. La même chose est vraie d'Emma Bovary, dont Jules de Gaultier avait déjà, en un livre prophétique quoique limité, étudié l'étrange aliénation. Emma se veut différente d'elle-même, elle se veut romantique par emprunt, ou par transposition. La Mathilde et le Julien de Stendhal trouvent leur médiation, l'une dans la copie de l'aristocratie héroïque, l'autre dans l'imitation du thème napoléonien. Le narrateur de Proust adopte les valeurs mondaines d'une société qui refuse l'auteur. "La passion [romancière] définit un désir *selon l'Autre* qui s'oppose au désir *selon soi*. . . [Ils] empruntent à *l'Autre* leurs désirs en un mouvement si fondamental, si original, qu'ils le confondent parfaitement avec la volonté d'être soi." Si l'on accepte d'appeler *médiateur* l'incarnation de l'idéal, on voit avec René Girard que la médiation est à la base non seulement de l'amour ou de la valorisation romanesques (Proust se voulant Guermantes ou Montesquiou) mais aussi de la haine ou de la dépréciation romanesques (le même Proust déteste aussi et ridiculise les fascinantes idoles de son snobisme). Stendhal, analyste de la "vanité" et Max Scheler, analyste du "ressentiment," ont ici montré le chemin à M. Girard, qui les cite et les commente abondamment. On lui saura gré de mettre en valeur, par exemple, un texte surprenant des *Mémoires d'un Touriste* où Stendhal définit les sentiments *modernes*, fruits de la vanité du XIX^{ème} siècle, "l'envie, la jalousie et la haine impuissante": ressorts contemporains de la médiation. A l'origine d'un désir, il y a toujours un autre désir.

Telle est, résumée à trop grands traits (la place m'est limitée) la thèse de M. Girard. Ce que je ne puis passer en revue ici, c'est la quantité de bonheurs d'expression, d'aperçus neufs, inattendus, saisissants que l'auteur rencontre tout au long de sa perspective. Les chapitres consacrés à Stendhal, à Proust, à Dostoïevsky mériteraient de longs commentaires. A chaque lecteur de se donner à lui-même ce plaisir, et de le trouver égal à celui que j'ai pris de page en page. Rares sont les livres qui requièrent, comme celui-ci, le constant, l'actif dialogue du lecteur avec l'auteur. Bien peu d'exemplaires de *Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque* ne témoigneront pas, je gage, par d'innombrables marginalia, de la force provocante des analyses de M. Girard. On voudra discuter ici et là, bien sûr. On n'écartera pas le problème. Je signale au hasard, comme particulièrement riches, les passages où M. Girard montre que, du Quichotte à Dostoïevsky et à Proust, la multiplication des médiateurs correspond à une fragmentation croissante de la conscience.

Il est temps de venir à l'essentiel. Ce qui sous-tend le livre de Girard, c'est évidemment une réflexion nouvelle sur le problème de l'aliénation, problème-clé de la philosophie occidentale depuis de cent cinquante ans, et qui est seulement la façon moderne de repenser les rapports du maître et de l'esclave. Hegel avait entendu faire de ceux-ci un des ressorts de l'histoire. Mais (comme tous les philosophes de l'histoire, Marx y compris) il croyait pouvoir amener, au terme de sa dialectique, une synthèse réconciliatrice des oppositions. Celle-ci n'est pas venue, c'est bien évident. L'histoire continue. Elle continuera. M. Girard suggère que la dialectique du maître et de l'esclave pourrait seulement avoir changé d'allure. Au lieu de violence physique, il s'agirait maintenant de violence spirituelle. A l'aliénation coercitive succéderait la "médiation" intellectuelle et romanesque, plus subtile, plus dissimulée, sinon moins tragique. "Ce sont les formes souterraines de la lutte des consciences qu'étudient les romanciers modernes" (p. 115). Proposition singulièrement brillante et séduisante. Je voudrais suivre M. Girard sur ce terrain. Je n'y parviens pas tout à fait.

Il m'est impossible par exemple d'accepter telle interprétation que donne M. Girard de cet épisode du *Rouge* où Julien se saisit d'une épée comme pour en menacer Mathilde. Attaché à démontrer que la dialectique romanesque est hypocrisie, René Girard estime qu'aux yeux même de Mathilde "la violence, loin de suivre les intérêts de celui qui l'exerce, révèle l'intensité de son désir: elle est donc un signe d'esclavage." Stendhal dit expressément le contraire. "Mademoiselle de la Mole le regardait étonnée. J'ai donc été sur le point d'être tuée par mon amant! se disait-elle. Cette idée la transportait dans les plus beaux moments du siècle de Charles IX et de Henri III. . . Elle le regardait avec des yeux où il n'y avait plus de haine. . . Je vais retomber dans quelque faiblesse pour lui, pensa Mathilde; c'est bien pour le coup qu'il se croirait mon seigneur et maître. . . Elle s'enfuit."¹ Ce n'est qu'un détail peut-être. On voudrait seulement que toutes les analyses d'un livre si riche fussent irréprochables.

Sur le fond, j'aurai une question plus générale à poser à M. Girard. Cette aliénation romanesque, ce "désir triangulaire," cette "nature imitative du

1. Et pourquoi l'étrange graphie de "Méthilde" (p. 29)? Stendhal n'écrivait pas ainsi le prénom familial de Mme Dembowski.

désir," s'ils étaient le mouvement même de tout artiste créateur? S'ils étaient le mouvement même de l'art? S'ils représentaient cette marge demi-picturale, demi-magique, qui sépare l'art de l'action et par là même justifie l'existence de l'art? Bien rarement les mêmes hommes sont à la fois les romanciers et les acteurs. Le peintre *shaman* des cavernes, dessinant l'animal des chasses futures, imite magiquement le désir des autres. Ce sont les autres, sans doute, qui sont les chasseurs. Don Quichotte imite Amadis et Julien Sorel Napoléon, mais ni Cervantès ni Stendhal ne peuvent, eux, se permettre la même imitation. Oui, nous sommes ainsi faits que nous nous nourissons des désirs les uns des autres. Mais est-ce plus vrai de Stendhal ou de Dostoïevsky que des autres grands créateurs, de l'auteur de l'*Odyssée* ou, au Moyen Age, des clercs adaptateurs du cycle de *Lancelot*? Peut-être la fonction secrète de l'artiste dans les sociétés humaines consiste-t-elle à mettre en lumière cette part d'aliénation de conscience inhérente à notre nature, et qui ne finira sans doute qu'avec elle. (ARMAND HOOG, *Princeton University*)

VOLUME LIII: INDEX

- Ackerman, Robert W. (review), 59-63
 Adams, Percy G., ed., *Crève-cœur's Eighteenth-Century Travels in Pennsylvania and New York* [ADRIENNE D. HYTIER], 297-98
 Anouilh, 155-56
 Apollinaire, 74-75
 Arland, 311-12
 Augst, Bertrand, *L'Otage* de Paul Claudel, 32-51

 Balayé, Simone, ed., *Madame de Staël: Lettres à Ribbing* [JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ], 298-302
 Balzac, 187-98
 Bataillon, Marcel, *La Célestine selon Fernando Rojas* [CHARLES F. FRAKER, JR.], 215-18
 Becker, Lucille (review), 156-58
 Bédé, Jean-Albert (review), 298-302
 Benito, José de, *Hacia la luz del Quijote* [ALEJANDRO RAMÍREZ], 223-24
 Biedma, Jaime Gil de, *Cántico: El Mundo y la poesía de Jorge Guillén* [MANUEL DURÁN], 238
 Bishop, Thomas (review), 307-309
 Blend, Charles D., *Early Expressions of Malraux's Art Theory*, 199-213
 Borgerhoff, E. B. O. (review), 292-95
 Bray, Bernard, *see* Dresden, Sem
 Breunig, L. C., ed., *Guillaume Apollinaire: Chroniques d'art (1902-1918)* [JEFFREY J. CARRE], 74-75
 Brody, Jules (review), 140-42
 Brombert, Victor, *The Intellectual Hero* [JEAN CARDUNER], 314-16

 Carduner, Jean (review), 314-16
 Carre, Jeffrey J. (review), 74-75
 Cerone, 81-95
 Cervantes, 223-24
 Chadourne, Marc, ed., *Isabelle, ou le Journal amoureux d'Espagne* [BRUCE MORRISSETTE], 63-66
 Chateaubriand, 128-38
 Cintra, Luis F. Dudley, *A Linguagem dos Foros de Castelo Rodrigo* [MARIO A. PEI], 58-59
 Clarac, Pierre, *La Fontaine par lui-même* [RENÉE J. KOHN], 146-48
 Claudel, 32-51
 Colette, 309-10
 Crémieux, 311-12
 Crève-cœur, 297-98

 Dante, 285-86
 Des Autelz, 220-23
 Diderot, 230-33, 260-68
 Dieckmann, Herbert (review), 149-51
 Dresden, Sem, Lein Geschiere et Bernard Bray, *La Notion de structure* [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE], 283-85
 Dupriez, Bernard, *Fénelon et la Bible: Les Origines du mysticisme fénelonien* [JEANNE-LYDIE GORÉ], 226-28
 Durán, Manuel (review), 238

 Edel, Leon (review), 153-55
 Edelman, Nathan et al., eds., *A Critical Bibliography of French Literature. Volume III: The Seventeenth Century* [W. G. MOORE], 144-46
 Eustis, A., *Marcel Arland, Benjamin Crémieux, Ramon Fernandez: Trois critiques de la Nouvelle Revue Française* [Louis Pamplume], 311-12
 Evans, Arthur R., Jr., *The Chef-d'œuvre inconnu: Balzac's myth of Pygmalion and Modern Painting*, 187-98

 Fellows, Otis (review), 148-49
 Fénelon, 226-28
 Fernandez, 311-12
 Fraker, Charles F., Jr. (review), 215-18
 France, Anatole, 236-38
 Françon, Marcel (review), 220-23
 Fréret, 149-51
 Freudmann, Félix R., *L'Etonnant Gourville* [RENÉ GIRARD], 224-26
 Frohock, W. M. (review), 75-78

 Gautier, Jean-Maurice, *Le Style des Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe de Chateaubriand* [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE], 128-38
 Gay, Peter (review), 302-304
 George, Albert J. (review), 234-35
 Geschiere, Lein, *see* Dresden, Sem
 Gide, 112-27
 Girard, René, *Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque* [ARMAND HOOG], 316-18
 — (review), 224-26
 Goré, Jeanne-Lydie (review), 226-28
 Gourville, 224-26
 Graham, Victor E. (reviews), 142-44, 288-89

- Grant, Elliott M., *The Bishop's Rôle in Zola's Le Rêve*, 105-11
 — (review), 304-305
- Grimsley, Ronald, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: A Study in Self-Awareness* [GEORGES MAY], 269-79
- Grossvogel, David I. (review), 155-56
- Guillén, 238
- Guy, Basil, *The Prince de Ligne and Diderot*, 260-68
- Hall, Bita May (review), 70-72
- Halls, W. D., *Maurice Maeterlinck: A Study of His Life and Thought* [THOMAS BISHOP], 307-309
- Hart, Thomas R., Jr., *Hierarchical Patterns in the Cantar de Mio Cid*, 161-73
- Hatzfeld, Helmut et Yves le Hir, *Essai de bibliographie critique de stylistique française et romane (1955-1960)* [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE], 281-83
- Havens, George R. (review), 236-38
- Healey, F. G., *The Literary Culture of Napoleon* [PETER GAY], 302-304
- Hoog, Armand (review), 316-18
- Hugo, 66-69
- Hytier, Adrienne D. (reviews), 218-20, 297-98
- Iknayan, Marguerite, *The Idea of the Novel in France: The Critical Reaction, 1815-1848* [ALBERT J. GEORGE], 234-35
- Jackson, W. T. H., *The Literature of the Middle Ages* [ROBERT W. ACKERMAN], 59-63
- Johansson, J. Viktor, *Sur "La Correspondance littéraire secrète" et son éditeur* [OTIS FELLOWS], 148-49
- Jones, George Fenwick, *Roland's Lament — A Divergent Interpretation*, 3-15
- Jost, François, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau Suisse: Étude sur sa personnalité et sa pensée* [GEORGES MAY], 269-79
- Journet, René et Guy Robert, eds., *Victor Hugo: Dieu (le Seuil du gouffre)* [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE], 66-69
- Jovicevich, Alexandre, ed., *Voltaire: Les Lettres d'Amabed* [JEAN SAREIL], 229-30
- Keller, Abraham C., *The Books and Stories of Rabelais*, 241-59
- Klapp, Otto, *Bibliographie der französischen Literaturwissenschaft. Band II: 1959-60* [JULES BRODY], 140-42
- Knapp, Bettina L. (review), 291-92
- Kohn, Renée (review), 146-48
- Kukenheim, Louis, *Esquisse historique de la linguistique française et de ses rapports avec la linguistique générale* [LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM], 280-81
- Labat, Alvin (review), 309-10
- La Fayette, 63-66
- La Fontaine, 146-48
- Laumonier, Paul, ed., *Pierre de Ronsard: Œuvres complètes. Vol. XVII* [VICTOR E. GRAHAM], 142-44
- Lebègue, Raymond, *Ronsard* [ISIDORE SILVER], 289-91
- Leconte de Lisle, 304-305
- Le Hir, Yves, *see* Hatzfeld, Helmut
- Levy, Raphael, *Contribution à la lexicographie française selon d'anciens textes d'origine juive* [LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM], 139-40
- Ligne, 260-68
- Loy, J. Robert (review), 230-33
- Maeterlinck, 307-309
- Maher, L. Donald, *Pascal's Suicide* (review article), 52-57
- Mallarmé, 69-70
- Malraux, 199-213
- Marks, Elaine, *Colette* [ALVIN LABAT], 309-10
- Marot, 286-88
- May, Georges, *Rousseau par lui-même* [IRA WADE], 295-97
 — *Deux nouveaux portraits de Jean Jacques* (review article), 269-79
- May, Gita, *Stendhal and Madame Roland*, 16-31
 — (review), 233-34
- Mayer, C. A., *La Religion de Marot* [EMILE V. TELLE], 286-88
- Mazzeo, Joseph Anthony, *Medieval Cultural Tradition in Dante's "Comedy"* [EDWARD WILLIAMSON], 285-86
- McGhee, Dorothy M., *The Cult of the "Conte moral"* [GITA MAY], 233-34
- Menichelli, Gian Carlo, *Bibliographie de Zola en Italie* [OLGA RAGUSA], 151-53
- Métra, 148-49
- Montherlant, 156-58
- Moore, Will G., *French Classical Literature: An Essay* [E. B. O. BORGERHOFF], 292-95
 — (review), 144-46
- Morrisette, Bruce (review), 63-66
- Mortimer, Ernest, *Blaise Pascal, the Life and Work of a Realist* [L. DONALD MAHER], 52-57

- Mourot, Jean, *Le Génie d'un style: Chateaubriand. Rythme et sonorité dans les Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe* [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE], 128-38
- Muller, Marcel (review), 312-14
- Napoleon, 302-304
- Nardis, Luigi de, ed., *Opere scelte di Stéphane Mallarmé* [OLGA RAGUSA], 69-70
- Pamplume, Louis (review), 311-12
- Pascal, 52-57
- Peckham, Lawton P. G. (reviews), 139-40, 280-81
- Pei, Mario A. (review), 58-59
- Perruchot, Henri, *Montherlant* [LUCILLE BECKER], 156-58
- Petrarch, 214-15
- Plotel, Jeanine Parisier (review), 72-74
- Pollin, Alice M., *Toward an Understanding of Cerone's El Mellopeo y maestro*, 81-95
- Pronko, Leonard Cabell, *The World of Jean Anouilh* [DAVID I. GROSSVOGEL], 155-56
- Putter, Irving, *The Pessimism of Leconte de Lisle: The Work and the Time* [ELLIOTT M. GRANT], 304-305
- Quinault, 174-86
- Rabelais, 96-104, 241-59
- Ragusa, Olga (reviews), 69-70, 151-53
- Ramírez, Alejandro (review), 223-24
- Richepin, 306-307
- Riffaterre, Michael, *Comment décrire le style de Chateaubriand?* (review article), 128-38
- (reviews), 66-69, 281-83, 283-85
- Robert, Guy, *see* Journet, René
- Robichez, Jacques, *Romain Rolland* [BITA MAY HALL], 70-72
- Rogers, Francis M., *The Travels of the Infante Dom Pedro of Portugal* [ADRIENNE D. HYTIER], 218-20
- Rojas, 215-18
- Roland, 16-31
- Rolland, 70-72
- Ronsard, 142-44, 288-89, 289-91
- Rousseau, 269-79, 295-97
- Sarcil, Jean, *Anatole France et Voltaire* [GEORGE R. HAVENS], 236-38
- (review), 229-30
- Scaglione, Aldo (review), 214-15
- Silver, Isidore (review), 289-91
- Simon, René, *Nicolas Fréret, académicien* [HERBERT DIECKMANN], 149-51
- Smith, Maxwell A. (review), 306-307
- Solovieff, Georges, ed., *Madame de Staël: Lettres à Narbonne* [JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ], 298-302
- Staël, 298-302
- Stendhal, 16-31
- Sutton, Howard, *The Life and Works of Jean Richepin* [MAXWELL A. SMITH], 306-307
- Telle, Emile V. (review), 286-88
- Tetel, Marcel, *La Valeur comique des accumulations verbales chez Rabelais*, 96-104
- Uitti, Karl D., *The Concept in the Symbolist Novel* [LEON EDEL], 153-55
- Ullmann, Stephen, *The Image in the Modern French Novel* [W. M. FROHOCK], 75-78
- Undank, J., ed., *Diderot: Est-il bon? Est-il méchant* [J. ROBERT LOY], 230-33
- Valéry, 72-74
- Van Eerde, John, *Quinault, The Court and Kingship*, 174-86
- Voltaire, 229-30, 236-38
- Wade, Ira (review), 295-97
- Whiting, Charles, *Valéry jeune poète* [JEANINE PARISIER PLOTTEL], 72-74
- Wiley, William L., *The Early Public Theatre in France* [BETTINA L. KNAPP], 291-92
- Wilkins, Burleigh Taylor, *L'Immoraliste Revisited*, 112-27
- Wilkins, Ernest Hatch, *Life of Petrarch* [ALDO SCAGLIONE], 214-15
- Williamson, Edward (review), 285-86
- Wilson, D. B., *Ronsard, Poet of Nature* [VICTOR E. GRAHAM], 288-89
- Young, Margaret L. M., *Guillaume des Autels: A Study of his Life and Works* [MARCEL FRANÇON], 220-23
- Zeltner-Neukomm, Gerda, *Das Wagnis des französischen Gegenwartromans* [MARCEL MULLER], 312-14
- Zola, 105-11, 151-53

Four Playwrights and a Postscript BRECHT, IONESCO, BECKETT, GENET

By **DAVID I. GROSSVOGEL**, *Cornell University*

GROSSVOGEL is concerned less with biography than with the theatrical genius of each playwright, since the heresies of these men are more profoundly expressed in their work than in their other vital commitments. He shows how the traditional demands of the craft contributed to an evolution in the thought and work of all four and in his Postscript suggests what their experiments portend for future drama, as he attempts to formulate an esthetics of the modern stage. 277 pages, \$4.00

Studies in Seventeenth-Century French Literature

Edited by **JEAN-JACQUES DEMOREST**,
Cornell University

OUTSTANDING American specialists in French literature of the seventeenth century have written these essays specifically for this volume, which is being published in honor of Morris Bishop, who, during his brilliant career as Professor of Romance Literature at Cornell University, distinguished himself by his studies in that area. The volume, the first of its kind in this field, gives well-balanced coverage to the major authors of the period, such as Malherbe, Molière, Racine, and Corneille.

328 pages, frontis., \$6.75

The Age of Criticism

The Late Renaissance in Italy

By **BAXTER HATHAWAY**, *Cornell University*

FIVE key concepts of the literary criticism synthesized in the late Renaissance in Italy are examined in such a way as to show how the shape of literary attitudes in the whole modern world was considerably influenced and determined by sixteenth-century Italian philosophers and literary theorists. The concepts examined are: poetry as imitation; poetry as a concrete-universal; poetry as a purgation; the poetic imagination; and the conflict between poetry and as art poetry as furor. 485 pages, \$7.50

CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS

124 Robert Place, Ithaca, New York





